

MEDIA NOTES: CNN'S ALTER-CATION: UNABOMBER '96

By Al Giordano

When Somerville's Chris Korda appeared as a phone guest on CNN's TalkBack Live program April 16 to represent Unapack--the Unabomber-for-president write-in campaign--she ended up in a heated brawl with Jonathan Alter, senior editor for Newsweek.

And Unapack officials are rejoicing at how, they say, Alter proved their point: that the media have narrowed the nation's political debate to exclude those matters--like our increasingly technological society--that have the most effect on people's daily lives.

Ever since the April 3 capture of Ted Kaczynski, suspected of being behind the Unabomber's 17-year campaign of mail bombs targeted at scientists and corporate executives, the Unabomber '96 campaign has been featured in many national media outlets, from Time to USA Today. The CNN program featured a live studio audience and a number of guests, including Korda and Alter.

Korda (the subject of a recent Phoenix profile, "The Four Pillars of Euthanism," Styles, April 12) had just finished defending her anti-technology campaign's use of a World-Wide Web site (<http://www.paranoia.com/unapack/>), telling the CNN hostess, "Hey, mutant times call for mutant tools, baby! This is a very urgent situation. We are not going to shirk from using any tools that we can use to try to disrupt the illusion we are holding on to."

Alter, asked to respond, reacted emotionally.

"Well, it disgusts me, to tell you the truth," Alter said, urging Korda to meet the family members of the Unabomber's victims. "It's perfectly fine to have a conversation about technology, but let's separate the discussion about technology from anything to do with the Unabomber....This guy's a pig and should be regarded as one."

Although Korda hadn't used the word to describe the Unabomber, Alter launched into a tirade against those who "call it an argument of genius." (Newsweek's main competitors, Time and U.S. News and World Report had both used the g-word on their covers featuring the Unabomber. Alter's mag had not.) "There are some arguments that relate to the history of technology and the way that technology does erode traditional ways of life that are worth discussing, but they have to be separated from any evaluation of the Unabomber--and I don't even want to talk to Chris about it. I don't want to talk to Chris because I don't accept the terms of this conversation."

Korda retaliated with a critique of Alter's terms: "There are a lot of people out there who are much too smart to be fooled by the image of society that is being portrayed in the media....The media

are the enemy. The media are responsible through education and through entertainment for adapting them to technological society."

"Why are you giving this publicity?" Alter snapped at the CNN hosts. "I mean, this is a pathetic publicity stunt....Ridiculous, ridiculous."

But Unapack officials hailed Alter's tantrum as a victory for their cause. "We ambushed Alter, we admit that," said campaign manager Lydia Eccles. "We will post the full transcript on our Web page, and analyze why journalists like Alter work so hard to mold perceptions of dangerous ideas."

CNN TALK BACK LIVE ON APRIL 16, 1996
LIVE INTERVIEW WITH CNN HOST AND PANEL INCLUDING JONATHAN ALTER,
SENIOR EDITOR, NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE

CNN HOST: Welcome back to Talk Back Live...it is truly amazing the support the Unabomber's philosophy gets in the unlikelyst of quarters, the Internet. Time to talk to with some folks who browse a Unabomber website. By phone joining us here is Chris Korda. Chris, tell me, I understand you set up a website on the Internet, can you tell us why?

CHRIS KORDA: Can you hear me?

CNN: Sure can, go ahead.

CK: Great...Well, we set up the Unabomber website because we're running the Unabomber write-in for president campaign. This is a real election campaign. We're going to try to get people to write the Unabomber in for President in every state of the United States.

CNN: This isn't a joke, is that what you're saying?

CK: That's right. This is not a joke.

CNN: Why do you think he'd make a good president?

CK: Well, we think he has all the qualities that would make a good president.

CNN: Such as?

CK: First of all, he's a very public figure, he's widely known, so he has tremendous name recognition.

(Laughter from CNN reporters) CNN: Yeah, I sense some sarcasm there, but please go on...

CK: No, no that's not funny at all, that's very serious. One of the problems with having a media system is that it's impossible for anyone to really have any political power in this country without having the support of the media, which brings me to the most important thing that we've got to try and discuss today. I've heard the comments of your previous guests and I think it's very important that we understand something. The Unabomber was fighting a guerilla war, OK? There have been casualties in this war. The war he is fighting is a war on behalf of wild nature. I need to put some context here, I don't know how many of your guests are aware of this, but humans have wiped out one-third of the other species on earth. We are currently eliminating a species every forty minutes. And--

CNN: I think a lot of people would take that comment and say that's absolutely baloney--

CK: Well, these are just simple facts. I should also--

Female journalist ("JC"): --fight for wild nature by blowing up advertising executives?

CK: Absolutely. It's very important to understand something here. The media is the number one industry in the United States of America. The media has in fact become the instrument by which humans are adapted to society.

FJ: Don't give me that. You're running an Internet website, you are the media, I mean, don't you see the irony of what you're doing, you're running an Internet website to support the Unabomber?

CK: Hey, mutant times call for mutant times, baby! This is a very urgent situation. We are not going to shirk from using any tools that we can use to try and disrupt the illusion that people are holding on to.

FJ: So what do you think the Unabomber would think of--

CNN: I want to get a time out, I'm sorry JC, I just want to interrupt you just for a second here. Need to bring in another guest at this time, Jonathan Alter is a senior editor with Newsweek magazine, uh, based on what you just heard from Chris Korda, what are your thoughts?

Jonathan Alter (Newsweek): Well, it disgusts me to tell you the truth. I mean I'd like him to meet with Mrs. Moser (sp?) in ah, Caldwell New Jersey, whose husband was blown up by the Unabomber a couple of years ago, he was mistakenly identified as being associated with an advertising campaign on behalf of, uh, the Exxon Valdez, it wasn't even true, the man is dead, he had a family, this is not a joke. Uh, it's perfectly fine to have a conversation about technology and, and the uses and abuses of technology, and to the extent that this manifesto stimulates that discussion that's all for the good, but let's separate the discussion about technology from anything to do with the Unabomber...

CNN: On that same note, though Jonathan--

Jonathan Alter: this guy's a pig and he should be regarded as one...

CNN: OK, my question was about the manifesto and if you agree with anything in there--

Jonathan Alter: Too nice, that's too nice to pigs, by the way. Um, I think he makes, ah, a number of, uh, of interesting points. To call them, to call it, an argument of genius is ridiculous. But there are some interesting, uh, points that he made that can

be the subject of conversation. For instance, he's critical of, um, of, ah, conservatives because conservatism in the United States now is often a belief in the unfettered marketplace, um, and that, you can't both believe in that and believe in traditional values, because the marketplace erodes traditional, uh, values, so, he accurately, the Unabomber in his manifesto accurately points out that there's this contradiction at the heart of conservatism. He says the same thing about liberalism--

CNN: OK, right, right--

Jonathan Alter: ...And we can go into that, so there are some arguments that, that relate to the history of technology and the way technology does erode traditional ways of life, that are worth discussing but they have to be separated from any evaluation of the Unabomber--and I don't even want to talk to Chris about it--

CNN: I think you bring up a very good points, yeah Jonathan, you bring up some very good points, I'd like to bring Chris Korda back in here on the telephone

Jonathan Alter: I don't want to talk to Chris because I don't accept the terms of this conversation--

CNN: No, don't, not a problem at all, but I'm curious to know from Chris Korda, what kind of interest he's wrapping on the Internet, uh, of the people that respond to you, what do they say?

Chris: We're getting tremendous response. I think people here need to understand that there are a lot of people out there who are much too smart to be fooled by the image of society that is being portrayed in the media. There's a lot of people out there who know perfectly well that the media are the enemy, that the media is responsible through education and through entertainment for adapting them to technological society. We have an expression here at Unapack, and the expression is "we are the veal." I want you all to think about that a little bit.

CNN: You mentioned Unapack. What is that quickly?

Chris: Unapack is the Unabomber political action committee.

Jonathan Alter: Why are you giving this publicity? I mean, this is a pathetic publicity stunt....

Chris: Listen you can, it's--

Jonathan Alter: Meet with some of the victims of--

Chris: OK, let's talk about violence. Can we talk about violence for a second?

Jonathan Alter: (unintelligible interruption)

Chris: Can we talk about violence for a second?

Jonathan Alter: ridiculous, ridiculous--

Chris: Can we talk about violence for a second?

CNN: Do it quickly. Fifteen seconds.

Chris: Ok, I just want just say, I want to just say, that the Unabomber has committed some violent acts, but I might I also say that this, in the very same way, qualifies him to be president, cause there has never been a president yet who hasn't committed violent acts, and in fact Bill Clinton, our current president, proved himself by killing black people in Arkansas.

JC: (inaudible) get him out of jail and run him for president--The Oklahoma bombing, let's run them for president...

(Audience clapping)

CNN: Let's get a time out on that, when we come back we want to talk more with (inaudible) in San Francisco about the folks that are leading this charge, and Chris Korda, I want to thank you for being with us today, but the question coming up next is could you be a closet luddite? Find out more about the luddite movement, you might have more in common with them than you first thought. That's coming up next on Talk Back Live.

AN INTERVIEW WITH REV. CHRIS KORDA

Reprinted from **Snuff It** Magazine

SI: The platform of the Church of Euthanasia includes suicide, abortion, cannibalism and sodomy. Why did you choose those four things?

Korda: Well, first of all we have to establish what they all have in common, and that is of course that they all reduce the human population, which is the primary goal of the church.

SI: And you approve of these four methods?

Korda: Well, these are the four that really stand out as being the most useful for the moment.

SI: But you approve of all methods?

Korda: We prefer methods that are voluntary. The population is going to get reduced one way or the other. We have a choice between allowing things to continue the way they are, in which case natural forces will reduce the population for us, with the maximum amount of violence and unpleasantness, or we can take steps to try and reduce our population voluntarily, through the four pillars of the church.

SI: You're opposed to involuntary population reduction?

Korda: We don't believe in mass murder. We would prefer to see things done in an orderly and sensible manner, to the extent that that's still possible. The longer we delay, the more likely it becomes that there won't be any sensible solution. Already we see chaos in our society, spreading out from the cities, and from the United States to the rest of the world. There's not much time left. If there's going to be an orderly solution it needs to be started immediately.

SI: And you're not just talking about zero population growth, you're talking about population reduction.

Korda: Absolutely. It's been well known for some time now that zero population growth just isn't enough, and we haven't even achieved that. It's a common belief that the United States has already achieved zero population growth, when in fact, nothing could be further from the truth. Our population continues to grow, and not just from immigration. In the rest of the world, the population is growing at an incredible rate. As things become more and more uncertain, due in large part to the tremendous strain placed on the ecosystem by the industrial nations, people have less and less confidence that their children will survive, so they have more of them. The numbers speak for themselves. At the current rate, the human population will reach eight billion by 2020, which is well within our lifetimes. It's just common sense that the Earth's ecosystem is not going to sustain that population, and that the side effects are going to be famine, disease, war, and chaos on a scale that we can't even imagine yet.

SI: The apocalypse.

Korda: Right.

SI: But wouldn't the apocalypse accomplish your goal?

Korda: Actually, no. The apocalypse would involve the destruction of the ecosystem, and that's what we're trying to prevent. There are many groups out there who support war, particularly nuclear war, as a way of drastically reducing or eliminating the human species. There is no doubt that the process would be effective, but it would also make vast areas of the Earth unsuitable for any form of life. What we're trying to do is put the human species back in

balance with the other species on the planet. We're trying to *prevent* the apocalypse.

SI: Abortion and suicide are obvious. These are responsible decisions that people can make. Can you be more specific about how sodomy will directly affect the population?

Korda: Well, no one ever got pregnant from sodomy.

SI: (laughs)

Korda: Seriously, why do you think it's still illegal in most states? We are living in a society that is almost entirely dominated by heterosexual males. Our government is a patriarchy. Our god is a father figure. There's been no check, no restraint, on male power for hundreds of years, and the results are horrifying.

SI: Why do males behave this way?

Korda: It all comes down to biology. The male has approximately six hundred million sperm in his body at any given time, and these little guys are jumping up and down in there yelling "let me out, let me out!" By contrast, the female has one egg. There's a well known saying that when the dick gets hard, the brain gets soft, and it's actually very close to the truth. Men will say anything to get laid. Their sperm makes them crazy.

SI: The dreaded sperm buildup!

Korda: It's not just that. Males also lose an enormous amount of energy when they ejaculate, unlike females, who lose their energy through menstruation. Women can have orgasms all day long without any problem. This is the principle reason females live longer than males. All of this was well understood in traditional Asian cultures, where boys were taught sexual yoga to help them retain their semen. In our society, men are encouraged to ejaculate as often as possible, so of course they become weak, and gradually develop deep resentment towards women. This makes them extremely dangerous, and causes sadism and violence. Industrial society is really the male's attempt to get revenge for his natural sexual inadequacy by raping the Earth.

SI: So you're opposed to ejaculation?

Korda: Yes, but we're also pragmatic. What we're saying is, since we have all these angry men trying to get rid of their sperm, why don't they get rid of it in each other?

SI: But what if they don't want to be queer?

Korda: Women can oblige just as easily. Grease it up. If more guys were fucking asses instead of pussies, the population would drop. That's the bottom line.

SI: (more laughs) Should they wear condoms?

Korda: Of course! We're opposed to all needless suffering, including AIDS.

SI: Okay, cannibalism. Are there any restrictions?

Korda: Look, we have fifty thousand automobile fatalities per year, and we're lucky if we recycle a few organs. Perfectly good meat is being buried in the ground, or incinerated. That meat should go straight to McDonald's.

The United States wastes vast amounts of energy so that its citizens can eat as much meat as they want. It's just plain dumb. It takes more than seven pounds of grain to create one pound of meat. Read [Diet for a Small Planet](#) if you want the exact figures. There's no sensible reason why the rest of the world should starve so that we can eat meat. It's just another form of cultural decadence. But the church is realistic. We're not expecting Americans to stop eating meat, any more than we're expecting them to stop ejaculating. If they have to eat meat, let's make sure it's *human* meat.

SI: Have you researched the nutritional value of human flesh?

Korda: There's nothing wrong with it. It's good for you, and tasty too. My understanding is it tastes rather like pork.

SI: Is it true that you'll be publishing a church cookbook?

Korda: There have been rumors to that effect. We're working on it. The main problem is testing the recipes.

The Church of Euthanasia

P.O.Box 261, Somerville, MA 02143 USA

coe@netcom.com www.paranoia.com/coe/

YOU WILL RECYCLE THIS

Der Spiegel - The Mirror, 48/1996

Society [Gesellschaft]

Sects - Religion

"Make love, not babies"

Henryk M. Broder on religious zealots in the USA, who want to reduce the number of people on the Earth

From the front the Reverend Chris Korda looks a little like Demi Moore, from the side he resembles Caesar in the Asterix-Comic.

In a long black dress, with a little handbag across his chest, a five-pointed silver star around his neck and long, pointed earrings, he would draw envious looks in any group of women. The hairdo is in place, the makeup is perfect, the lipstick not laid on too thick. Only in his carriage does the Reverend show that he did not come into the world as a woman. Chris Korda moves more gracefully, it is true, than Heinz Rhhman in Charley's Aunt, but that certain swing of the hips, which women command by nature, is not his strength.

Reverend Chris Korda is founder and spiritual rector of a church called the Church of Euthanasia (COE). Because it is recognized by the official US government financial authority as a socially-beneficial educational institution, gifts to the Church are tax-deductible. Contrary to the practices of other churches, religious societies and sects - which treat their adherents to a profusion of rules, requirements and prohibitions - the Church of Euthanasia knows but one "commandment", which they preach absolutely without compromise: "Thou Shall Not Procreate"

Whoever makes this single law his own, whether Christian, Moslem, Jew or Atheist, is welcome as a member. Mothers and fathers of children will be taken in, too - provided that they pledge to bring no more progeny into the world. Whoever agrees, and then makes a child anyway, will be excommunicated. "We welcome the children," says the Reverend, "however, we find there are already quite enough of them."

This reduction to the bare essentials is not the only essence of the COE. Founded in 1992 and registered in the state of Delaware ("because the taxes there are cheaper than in Massachusetts"), the COE is some bytes ahead of its time, a church of the 21st century - thanks to the Worldwide Web and the Internet.

In the Boston vicinity, the center of its activities, the COE counts only "a couple dozen" registered members, in the entire USA "a couple hundred." However the host of hangers-on, says Reverend Korda, "is in the thousands and is constantly increasing." Over 100,000 guests have visited the Homepage of the COE ([http://\[sic\]www.paranoia.com\[sic\]coe](http://[sic]www.paranoia.com[sic]coe)) in the past year, and this

year it appears as if it will double.

In the beginning people forgathered in a tiny "chapel" in the cellar of a multi-family house beneath the picture of the suicide doctor [lit.: dying-helper] Jack Kevorkian ("We admire him from a safe distance") and together read texts from Albert Camus, James Baldwin and Allen Ginsburg. In between these meetings the members and hangers-on of the COE communicate with one another in the world-wide space of the Internet, and likewise the sermons of Reverend Korda are electronically dispersed as "E-sermons."

Other than the "chapel", which is reminiscent of a surrealistically gotten-up party-place from the '50s, the leadership circle around Reverend Korda convenes in the "Middle East" on Massachusetts Avenue, one of the few restaurants in the city to which the Reverend does not give a wide berth. Because he is a vegan, a radical vegetarian. Not only does he eat no meat and no fish, he shuns all animal products, living consequently without milk, eggs, cheese, curd and butter.

In the summer the Reverend wears linen, in winter rubber. He uses a lipstick made by "Clinique", as the manufacturer does not test his products on animals. Let other divines serve God and mankind, Reverend Chris Korda has assigned his service "to the Earth and the animals [Arten]." So that the Earth is not destroyed and the species survive, the human population of the Earth must be reduced - "through voluntary measures", as the Reverend intones, in no case through force.

Among these measures are the renunciation of propagation, discontinuing the taboos against and the criminalization of suicide, and the promotion of sexual practices that do not serve reproduction. "There are simply too many people on the Earth," says Korda, as he spoons up some pea soup, "either we reduce the number of people, or Nature will take the duty away from us."

In fact it is no longer a question of if, but only of when. Thus the process of self-destruction could at least be slowed down through judicious conduct.

"We are not the only organization dedicated to protecting the Earth from humankind," says the Reverend, and checks his hairdo and makeup in a mirror, "we are actually relatively moderate, since choice is our remedy, there are others who are much more radical."

The "First Church of Christ, Abortionists", for example, who are in favor of forced abortions; the "Voluntary Human Extinction Movement", who would like to do away with the human race in one generation; the "GAIA Liberation Front", a "very extreme group", who would spread a deadly virus, to bring about the final resolution of the problem of mankind. And then there's always the "Unabomber Political Action Committee", a support group for the alleged "Unabomber", arrested in Montana at the beginning of

April. The Reverend can well sympathize with his love of nature and hatred of civilization.

The leader of The Church of Euthanasia, was born in 1962 in New York, son of the novelist Michael Korda ("Success", "Power") and a playwright. He is of course neither a millennialist nor weary of his own life. For the sticker "Save the planet, kill yourself," which he designed and distributes, Korda offers a dialectical-spiritual explanation in two parts. When a person is at the end of his rope and needs to kill, then it would simply be better if he were to kill himself instead of another person - or an animal. Moreover, "kill yourself" could also mean: kill your Self, become something else!

Korda knows that he provokes ambiguities, surmises and misunderstandings. And indeed he wishes to do so. "Lack of clarity / unclear situations are good. They get people's minds out of their well-worn ruts. Although neither transvestite nor transsexual, he often wears women's clothes, since he does not have to adhere to a sex role. And there is a concept for it: "a transgendered person," a person beyond gender.

Early on in life, at 12 or 13 years of age, he felt that he "had an extremely unusual personality," his outlook on things seemed to be "entirely different, as if from another star." He had "very few friends, and as a result displayed more anger in school, with his parents, and all authority." He resisted all attempts "to break me, to make me function like everyone else."

At age 14 he ran away from home, later he studied Information Science and went through "several careers," such as street musician, jazz guitarist, sound technician, record producer, and female impersonator in the cabarets of Provincetown on Cape Cod. For all that, his only profession was "consultant" and "knowledge worker," he advised individuals and companies how they could make best use of their knowledge.

In 1992 he meditated a great deal and one day had "a dream and a vision": "Save the planet, kill yourself!" Had he not founded the Church of Euthanasia out of this experience, he would apparently have been dead before long, by his own hand. The church is his personal survival strategy.

As his "heroes and models," the Reverend Korda names the philosopher Rudolf Steiner, the sex researcher Wilhelm Reich, and the anarchist Abby Hoffman - a wild mix, which, however, would not cause an explosion in the civilized climate of New England.

Korda signs his letters with a friendly "Thank you for not breeding," and when he goes shopping with his Mitsubishi, he does not forget to feed the parking meter. Should global collapse be imminent, the Reverend wouldn't want to make the situation worse through disorderly conduct. He considers good manners to be very

important and rejects war as a means of population control. "First of all war destroys the environment, second, after every war there's a baby boom, which equalizes the losses."

Also on the question of why he preaches his message to Americans, whose rate of population increase is relatively static, instead of taking it to the high-reproduction inhabitants of the third world, he has a rational answer prepared. "We have no right to be giving advice to people we have exploited. Besides, each North American produces 100 times as much trash as an African."

During this year the organizational structure of the Church of Euthanasia should be completed. Korda, supported by a three-person directorate, but finally doing everything himself, would like to organize a country-wide field-operation on the model of the "Thank you for not smoking" campaign. Everywhere in the USA, on billboards, those gigantic advertising signs along the highways, the sentence "Thank you for not breeding" should be on display. Then he would like to carry through a "procreation-free day," first in Boston, after that in Massachusetts, finally throughout all of America, "but, of course, with sex."

Korda knows that this is a Utopian idea. And his idea of creating "a procreation-free, sex-friendly and vegetarian place of refuge," for like-minded people "who don't want to live together with those people," is in this same category.

So he concentrates his energy at the present time on what can actually be accomplished. He borrows from Radio Shack a battery-operated bullhorn and from Rent-A-Wreck he rents a beat-up little army truck with which he takes a dozen placards, and as many friends as are willing to do so, on a sortie to the Front.

Pious Christians from "Operation Rescue" have been called up to demonstrate in front of Preterm Clinic in Brookline. At this place, just two years ago, a fanatical abortion opponent shot a staff member of the clinic. But the demonstrators don't want to think of the murder, only that in the Preterm Clinic abortions are still going on.

Beneath the picture of Our Lady of Guadalupe, the Protectress of the Unborn, about 100 believers pray the rosary. Across from them stands a handful of counterdemonstrators with pro-choice placards, women from the National Organization for Women (NOW). They shout "Keep your rosaries off our ovaries!"

A couple meters farther on, separated from the police by a barrier, Reverend Korda and his friends have gotten into position.

Of all the groups they seem to have the most fun at the demo. The words ("Peace, Love and Sterility," "Fuck breeding") come across as a joke through the displacement of the political statements. But the believers from "Operation Rescue" don't let themselves get provoked, they never even look over at them, as Korda's people shout "think quick, think fast, every prayer may be

your last!"

The way seems open for a confrontation as an elderly woman from the "Operation Rescue" demonstrators goes across to the Church of Euthanasia people, takes a tiny flask from her pocket and sprinkles "holy water". But a policeman pulls the woman back: "Ma'am, just keep going."

After the demonstration Korda and his friends balance the books over a mug of coffee at Dunkin' Donuts. "There were three times as many of us as the people from NOW." Rebecca, who carried the sign "Make Love Not Babies" is also pleased: "The police had a lot of fun."

Then the party breaks up. The truck from Rent-A-Wreck has to go back, otherwise there's another day's rent to pay. Then Reverend Korda wants to get right to his computer, to update the Homepage. "Have a nice day," he calls to a passerby, who turns toward him, "save the planet and kill yourself."

The sect craze of Americans is little written about publicly. While people in the Federal Republic regard sects with distrust, in the USA extremely ludicrous quasi-religious groups can get going quite freely. The "Church of Euthanasia," founded in 1992, is one of more than 1000 communities of belief in the USA. They are in favor of a "restoration of the balance between the Earth and humankind" - by reducing humankind. The sect, headquartered in Boston, whose actions are reminiscent of Dada, is recognized as an educational organization.

Church of Euthanasia leader Korda: procreation-free, sex-friendly, vegetarian.

in front of a picture of suicide doctor Kevorkian.

p. 152 Korda demonstrating Rosaries and ovaries

p. 153 callout: Words of sterility, and holy water. At the demo, the police have a lot of fun.

Extra! interviews UNAPACK

The Liberty Cafe, Cambridge, April 21, 1996

Partial transcript of Chris Korda and Lydia Eccles' TV interview with Extra!

Extra!: Why do you think the issue that the Unabomber has presented is so important?

Korda: The Unabomber is important because he is the only public figure right now who is raising the real questions, the real issues which are the destruction of Wild Nature and the dehumanizing effect that technology has on us.

I don't think that either the Republican, the Democratic or any of the third party candidates are going to address this question in any kind of important way.

Eccles: Mainstream electoral politics are dealing with trivial issues while we are headed for disaster. And there is a massive denial of the environmental disaster and the social disaster that is happening. So the object of UNAPACK, for the Unabomber Write-In Campaign, is for people to break away from the bond of politics.

Could we be more conversational? I think it works better if we can have a conversation.

Extra!: I just have to get these basic things down, that's what I do. Then we'll go into more things and chat. Chris, why are the issues of the Unabomber important to you? What made you so proactive about the Unabomber?

Korda: I personally feel that the Unabomber is very important because he's the only public figure right now getting any media attention who is going to raise the real questions, the real issue. And the real issue is the destruction of Wild Nature.

We are in the middle of a global environmental crisis. Humans have already destroyed almost one third of the species on earth. We are currently losing a species every forty minutes. That's actually up from every sixty minutes in the 70's. We lose an acre of trees every eight seconds in the United States alone. That's a tremendous crisis and I don't think that either the Republican or the Democratic or any third party candidates are going to address that issue in any kind of serious way.

The Unabomber was addressing that issue, his ideas have received major public attention, and that's a tremendous victory.

Extra!: Lydia, same question.

Eccles: To me, I was attracted to the Unabomber because he was recognizing the failure of our political system. He was

recognizing that under what we are calling Democracy and freedom, the vital issues can never be addressed because the media is very involved in upholding the path of developing technology. That's why he targeted the media.

So it was a revelation to me to see someone break open the political discussion so that issues like our advance towards extinction could be addressed rather than issues like a fifty cent increase in the minimum wage.

When the Unabomber spoke, the rest of politics became ridiculous next to what he had to say. So he was the starting point and we feel like we have to pick up where he left off and push those ideas further. And the interesting thing is that the media immediately responded by trying to separate the ideas from the man, and what we are trying to do is just the opposite.

They are trying to say, we must talk about this man as a psychopath and say that what he was trying to say doesn't matter: the important thing is that he is a psychopath.

What we are trying to do is just the opposite and say the ideas really do matter. It was an intentionally political act with great commitment behind it. It was not gratuitous violence, it was extremely intentional violence. And our campaign is a non-violent campaign.

We represent the middle ground between a person like the Unabomber, who decided that the system was so closed off that no change was possible working within it, and people who believe that you can achieve change through the system.

We don't believe that we can achieve change through the system. So what we are going to do is vote against the system. We are using the classic democratic process to try and create a rupture in politics. And once that rupture is created, then we think that people can start looking at the real power issues in their life.

Extra!: A lot of people will immediately think that because you support the Unabomber's message, you also support the killing that he has done. Do you support the killings?

Korda: The first objection that people always raise is that the Unabomber is a killer, he is a terrorist. This is very interesting because there is a different way of looking at this.

We could say that the Unabomber was in fact fighting a guerrilla war. He was fighting a guerrilla war in defense of Wild Nature. And there have been, as in all wars, casualties. Now why isn't the Unabomber a war hero like General Colin Powell? Why isn't he considered a hero? Well, we can look at General Colin Powell and say that he was responsible for killing hundreds of thousands of people in Iraq, and he was fighting a war in defense of America's

right to control the price of oil. The Unabomber, on the other hand, was fighting a war against technology, in defense of Wild Nature, and he is by comparison considered a serial killer or a terrorist. Well, this is very interesting. This is a double standard, and I think it is very important that people realize this.

It's one thing if you have an objection to all violence, if you completely object to all violent acts. That's admirable. I myself completely object to violent acts, and I don't believe in violence as a way to change society. But I think that...people like me are the exception and not the rule. I think in fact if you look at the matter honestly, most Americans *supported* the war in Iraq. They supported the war for oil. So really we can say that most people aren't opposed to the use of violence so long as it serves their ends, so long as it supports *their* way of life.

And I think that is very important to understand. That we need to be honest and not be naive, and understand that the Unabomber was fighting a war on behalf of Wild Nature and the media was his target. He knew perfectly well that his ideas would never receive wide discussion unless he used violence to blackmail the media into discussing them. So he had a very sensible and effective military strategy.

Eccles: The ideas that he is bringing up would never be allowed to be discussed under any other circumstances except as a media story of crime which frankly has entertainment value.

So when people say to us why don't you pick a mainstream candidate who is expressing precisely those views, even expressing them better? Our response is that we had Alan Keyes on a hunger strike to try to be heard in the election and he was mainstream. So even people who are an iota of the mainstream don't have a voice.

So just as you are talking to us right now because of the fact that he is a killer, if we were here working for some no-name person you wouldn't be talking to us. And I think that the very fact that your network has covered the Unabomber with your response knowing that he struck a very important chord. Part of you doing the story is knowing that there is a fascination with the man and that he really did speak to everyone in what he did.

Extra!: Do you think there are more people out there who support the Unabomber than are actually admitting to it?

Eccles: We already claim as a constituency all the people who have taken the first step and stopped voting. When people stop voting they have taken the first step of voting for the Unabomber because they have decided that they have no power by voting. So I think that gives us the majority at this point, probably more than Clinton or Dole. So we can build on that foundation. We are really looking for the apathetic voter.

Extra!: And you Chris?

Korda: I agree. If everyone who usually stays home and doesn't vote gets out there and votes for the Unabomber, we will win in November. Because everybody knows perfectly well that the media interprets apathy as an affirmation of the system. That is the only way it could be interpreted.

It has to be interpreted that way because otherwise it would be too destabilizing to the whole notion of political freedom in this country. What if the media interpreted the apathy of the voters in this country as a rejection of the system? What would we have then?

Would we declare the elections null and void? In some European countries this happens. In some European countries if enough people don't vote, they have to redo the election. That doesn't happen here, and we have to ask why that doesn't happen here, and the reason that doesn't happen here is that the media is controlled by corporations.

It's not very good, for the corporations that control the media, if the message gets out that the political system is an illusion and nothing is really being decided. That's bad. That is not going to sell stuff. So it's very important that people realize this and instead of staying home and doing nothing, which would be interpreted as affirmation, they get out there and cast a vote for the Unabomber. Because a vote for the Unabomber can never be interpreted as anything but protest.

Extra!: Do you have any idea what the numbers are like of the people that actually support the Unabomber? Lydia, how many people in the area are actually more supportive than we known?

Eccles: Well first of all, a lot of people have directly contacted me and people already call up and know about the campaign already.

But more importantly, when we look to the experts to see what the psyche of the voter is and the incredible importance the press has placed on the Unabomber, especially in terms of trying to take the politics out of the Unabomber.

Together with many, many letters to the editor, and columnists in every major paper writing empathetic columns. And on top of that, all you have to do is look at advertising and you see that the majority of advertising appeals to people on the basis of the kinds of desires for freedom and self realization that the Unabomber is talking about.

So we feel like is a certain number of conscious supporters, a lot of people who are very interested, and then a lot of people who are unconsciously connected to our campaign. And our tactic is to make them conscious of it, and make that act of liberation,

actually going into the voting booth and actually freeing themselves that way.

We got a letter from someone who said I have never in my life voted, I never wanted to vote, and for the first time, I want to vote, I have a reason to vote, would you please put on your web page how I can register to vote. And that is stuff we are working to do.

Extra!: Why do you want the Unabomber to be president? Is it just because we are in a campaign year or if we weren't would it be something different? Is that the most important thing you could think of or is it specifically him?

Korda: The Unabomber can't be president: if elected he will not serve. So obviously, this isn't about the man, it isn't about actually getting him elected. It's about creating a utopian moment. It's about creating a rupture in the media system, the system that covers the political election.

If enough people actually get out there and actually vote for the Unabomber in November, it will be a stunning moment. It will be historical. Nothing like that will have ever happened before in American history and that's what we are really shooting for.

We are trying to create a situation in which the media will have to acknowledge that it is not business as usual. That things can't go on the way they have been going on. That's why we have the three R's.

We have to reveal the resignation that people feel. People feel resigned to their technological fate. They feel dependent. They feel powerless. They feel that things can't be any other way than the way they are. They are surrounded by plastic. They are surrounded by asphalt. They are surrounded by computers. Their lives are artificial and shallow and they don't know how to change it. They feel resigned to their fate. So we have to reveal that resignation.

We have to be honest about it and then we have to try and use that resignation to *rupture* the media system, to get people to be angry about their resignation and go out there and vote for the Unabomber as an act of protest. If they do that, that would rupture the political system, the political illusion. Then we have a *rapture*, a rapturous moment. A utopian moment where people can actually permit themselves, even if it's only for a minute, to begin to imagine a society based on pleasure and freedom, rather than punishment and control and expropriation.

Extra!: If this gentleman is actually the Unabomber, he doesn't have a computer, he doesn't have a web site. Why do you guys have a web site?

Eccles: That would be like saying why did the Unabomber go to the New York Times. He's critical of the media, why would he want the New York Times to publish his manifesto?

For the very same reason, we are dealing with a control system and we are trying to crack open that control system. That control system controls our ability to, as people, communicate amongst ourselves. And we have a false dialogue imposed upon us which isn't our dialogue so that state of dependency is a problem. We use it as a tool because that is the only way we can communicate.

We have no interest in being purists, our only interest is in winning by what ever way we can by non-violent methods.

People find it paradoxical but it's not paradoxical at all. We are using the Internet for the same reason that the Unabomber used the New York Times. Because the media is controlling the communications system. They are controlling the ideas that we are allowed to consider. It's all part of one system so that is our problem.

Our choices would be to not communicate at all or to use a system to which we've been put in forced dependency upon in order to have a dialogue. The only thing that makes it at all possible is the Unabomber's original act. The crime is what makes it possible. That's what gave us the power to communicate.

The reason that we have to use the tool of the control mechanism that we are opposing is because they have stripped us of every other means of communication. It's forced us to be dependent upon it. So we don't have a choice of another tool besides various forms of mass communications at this point.

We are on the Web to do this. We are not on the Web browsing. In fact there are lots of articles about why do computer people have so much interest in the Unabomber. And I think people forget that people who are working with computers on the Internet, these are people who are forced to spend their whole life in front of the screen. Of course they are the ones who are most interested in the Unabomber. And furthermore, half the time when they come and hit on our Web page, they do it at work.

Korda: People keep asking if we are such luddites, if we support the Unabomber's ideas, why are we on the Internet? And the answer is, mutant times call for mutant tools. The best tools to dismantle something are the tools that were used to create it.

In this case, technological society is composed of whole layers of control and hierarchy, education, entertainment, advertising, the newspapers, the radio, the television. All of these are layers of control by which humans are adapted to technological society. Psychiatry is another layer of control. People are actually encouraged to accept themselves, to accept their fate, to be

resigned.

So we feel that the best way to attack these layers of control is to use them against themselves. That's why we try and engage you, the media. We try and engage the media and transmit messages that are essentially viruses. These are messages that are antithetical to the whole corporate system of control.

Extra!: Why would people support the Unabomber?

Eccles: I'm glad that people ask that question. And it's a question that we ask ourselves. They should sit down and ask themselves, why am I being presented with certain deaths and not others. For instance, when our enslavement to the automobile means that every year there are going to be more cases of deadly skin cancer, auto fatalities, death from stress, from working, deaths from eating high fat foods, from a sedentary lifestyle. Is there any place that those deaths are ever counted? And because they are never counted, they are anonymous. We subject ourselves to an anonymous serial killer. If you took that anonymous serial killer, that technological system with corporations, you would find that the Unabomber's killing would be nothing next to that.

Extra!: How do you explain that to a kid in eighth grade?

Eccles: I have no problem. Eighth graders understand this campaign immediately. We have no problem with young people. They understand that we are dealing with their future. The best person for this campaign is someone just out of college and realizing that they are supposed to give up the rest of their lives for something meaningless, in order to further a system that is drawing us to extinction.

I mean basically technology is the opposite of adaption. I mean normally what animals do is they adapt themselves to live harmoniously with the environment they are in. And what man has done is created technology which is a counter-adaption to the earth. It's a system of conquest and we are getting to the end of that now.

We are getting to the point where we are going to make ourselves extinct because we are unwilling to adapt to our environment. It's a collision course and people can either say we are going to remain on this path and create a bigger and bigger artificial environment or they can take the opposite path and say no, we are going to try and live in equilibrium and harmony with the earth.

But there is no middle ground, there is too much denial going on. People can push out of their minds uncomfortable truths, but we are on cars to the death camps and we're not willing to talk about it.

Extra!: Could you get the person who is whistling? Someone is

whistling! These are great answers but the reality is this is probably going to be a two minute piece.

Camera Person: Try and shrink the length of your answers a little bit.

Extra!: Lydia, you just talked about a collision course, do you think it is too late, is there any point, why bother?

Eccles: I don't think it is too late at all. As long as we are in a trance, as long as we are in a collective trance, it is too late. But if we can make a rupture...I'm a very hopeful person and this whole campaign is about the opportunity that the Unabomber created. That is exciting.

Extra!: How's that sound in the background? We'll just have to deal with it. We are in a cafe.

(a lengthy discussion about B-roll and production issues)

Korda: I have something I want to add.

Extra!: We'll get to that, keep it in your mind. We probably pulled something from the wire on you right?

Korda: We sent you a press release.

Mass High Tech: What's your interest in this? Why did you come here to interview these folks?

Extra!: Because it's my job.

MHT: But what's your personal interest in this?

Extra!: It's my job. I'd be in New Hampshire skiing if this were not my job.

MHT: You have no personal interest in this?

Extra!: No, I'm just a reporter.

Korda: We should tell you about our reporter self-help group.

Extra!: Reporter self-help group.

MHT: How long have you been reporting?

Extra!: About two years.

MHT: Do you like it?

Extra!: Yes.

MHT: Is this one of the more interesting stories that you have done?

Extra!: No. I'm an entertainment reporter.

MHT: And this isn't entertainment?

Extra!: Well, I normally do actors. That's my thing. I'm an actress. We have to get on with this because they have only booked these people for half a day.

Extra! interviews UNAPACK

Cambridge, April 21, 1996

Partial Transcript of Chris Korda and Lydia Eccles' TV interview with Extra!

Extra!: Why do you think the issue that the Unabomber has presented is so important?

Korda: The Unabomber is important because he is the only public figure right now who is raising the real questions, the real issues which are the destruction of Wild Nature and the dehumanizing effect that technology has on us.

I don't think that either the Republican, the Democratic or any of the third party candidates are going to address this question in any kind of important way.

Eccles: Mainstream electoral politics are dealing with trivial issues while we are headed for disaster. And there is a massive denial of the environmental disaster and the social disaster that is happening. So the object of UNAPACK, for the Unabomber Write-In Campaign, is for people to break away from the bond of politics.

Could we be more conversational? I think it works better if we can have a conversation.

Extra!: I just have to get these basic things down, that's what I do. Then we'll go into more things and chat. Chris, why are the issues of the Unabomber important to you? What made you so proactive about the Unabomber?

Korda: I personally feel that the Unabomber is very important because he's the only public figure right now getting any media attention who is going to raise the real questions, the real issue. And the real issue is the destruction of Wild Nature.

We are in the middle of a global

environmental crisis. Humans have already destroyed almost one third of the species on earth. We are currently losing a species every forty minutes. That's actually up from every sixty minutes in the 70's. We lose an acre of trees every eight seconds in the United States alone. That's a tremendous crisis and I don't think that either the Republican or the Democratic or any third party candidates are going to address that issue in any kind of serious way.

The Unabomber was addressing that issue, his ideas have received major public attention, and that's a tremendous victory.

Extra!: Lydia, same question.

Eccles: To me, I was attracted to the Unabomber because he was recognizing the failure of our political system. He was recognizing that under what we are calling Democracy and freedom, the vital issues can never be addressed because the media is very involved in upholding the path of developing technology. That's why he targeted the media.

So it was a revelation to me to see someone break open the political discussion so that issues like our advance towards extinction could be addressed rather than issues like a fifty cent increase in the minimum wage.

When the Unabomber spoke, the rest of politics became ridiculous next to what he had to say. So he was the starting point and we feel like we have to pick up where he left off and push those ideas further. And the interesting thing is that the media immediately responded by trying to separate the ideas from the man, and what we are trying to do is just the opposite.

They are trying to say, we must talk about this man as a psychopath and say that what he was trying to

say doesn't matter: the important thing is that he is a psychopath.

What we are trying to do is just the opposite and say the ideas really do matter. It was an intentionally political act with great commitment behind it. It was not gratuitous violence, it was extremely intentional violence. And our campaign is a non-violent campaign.

We represent the middle ground between a person like the Unabomber, who decided that the system was so closed off that no change was possible working within it, and people who believe that you can achieve change through the system.

We don't believe that we can achieve change through the system. So what we are going to do is vote against the system. We are using the classic democratic process to try and create a rupture in politics. And once that rupture is created, then we think that people can start looking at the real power issues in their life.

Extra!: A lot of people will immediately think that because you support the Unabomber's message, you also support the killing that he has done. Do you support the killings?

Korda: The first objection that people always raise is that the Unabomber is a killer, he is a terrorist. This is very interesting because there is a different way of looking at this.

We could say that the Unabomber was in fact fighting a guerrilla war. He was fighting a guerrilla war in defense of Wild Nature. And there have been, as in all wars, casualties. Now why isn't the Unabomber a war hero like General Colin Powell? Why isn't he considered a hero? Well, we can look at General Colin Powell and say that he was responsible for

killing hundreds of thousands of people in Iraq, and he was fighting a war in defense of America's right to control the price of oil. The Unabomber, on the other hand, was fighting a war against technology, in defense of Wild Nature, and he is by comparison considered a serial killer or a terrorist. Well, this is very interesting. This is a double standard, and I think it is very important that people realize this.

It's one thing if you have an objection to all violence, if you completely object to all violent acts. That's admirable. I myself completely object to violent acts, and I don't believe in violence as a way to change society. But I think that...people like me are the exception and not the rule. I think in fact if you look at the matter honestly, most Americans *supported* the war in Iraq. They supported the war for oil. So really we can say that most people aren't opposed to the use of violence so long as it serves their ends, so long as it supports *their* way of life.

And I think that is very important to understand. That we need to be honest and not be naive, and understand that the Unabomber was fighting a war on behalf of Wild Nature and the media was his target. He knew perfectly well that his ideas would never receive wide discussion unless he used violence to blackmail the media into discussing them. So he had a very sensible and effective military strategy.

Eccles: The ideas that he is bringing up would never be allowed to be discussed under any other circumstances except as a media story of crime which frankly has entertainment value.

So when people say to us why don't you pick a mainstream candidate who is expressing precisely those views, even expressing them better? Our response is that we had Alan

Keyes on a hunger strike to try to be heard in the election and he was mainstream. So even people who are an iota of the mainstream don't have a voice.

So just as you are talking to us right now because of the fact that he is a killer, if we were here working for some no-name person you wouldn't be talking to us. And I think that the very fact that your network has covered the Unabomber with your response knowing that he struck a very important chord. Part of you doing the story is knowing that there is a fascination with the man and that he really did speak to everyone in what he did.

Extra!: Do you think there are more people out there who support the Unabomber than are actually admitting to it?

Eccles: We already claim as a constituency all the people who have taken the first step and stopped voting. When people stop voting they have taken the first step of voting for the Unabomber because they have decided that they have no power by voting. So I think that gives us the majority at this point, probably more than Clinton or Dole. So we can build on that foundation. We are really looking for the apathetic voter.

Extra!: And you Chris?

Korda: I agree. If everyone who usually stays home and doesn't vote gets out there and votes for the Unabomber, we will win in November. Because everybody knows perfectly well that the media interprets apathy as an affirmation of the system. That is the only way it could be interpreted.

It has to be interpreted that way because otherwise it would be too destabilizing to the whole notion of political freedom in this country. What if the media interpreted the apathy of the voters in this country as a

rejection of the system? What would we have then?

Would we declare the elections null and void? In some European countries this happens. In some European countries if enough people don't vote, they have to redo the election. That doesn't happen here, and we have to ask why that doesn't happen here, and the reason that doesn't happen here is that the media is controlled by corporations.

It's not very good, for the corporations that control the media, if the message gets out that the political system is an illusion and nothing is really being decided. That's bad. That is not going to sell stuff. So it's very important that people realize this and instead of staying home and doing nothing, which would be interpreted as affirmation, they get out there and cast a vote for the Unabomber. Because a vote for the Unabomber can never be interpreted as anything but protest.

Extra!: Do you have any idea what the numbers are like of the people that actually support the Unabomber? Lydia, how many people in the area are actually more supportive than we known?

Eccles: Well first of all, a lot of people have directly contacted me and people already call up and know about the campaign already. But more importantly, when we look to the experts to see what the psyche of the voter is and the incredible importance the press has placed on the Unabomber, especially in terms of trying to take the politics out of the Unabomber.

Together with many, many letters to the editor, and columnists in every major paper writing empathetic columns. And on top of that, all you have to do is look at advertising and you see that the majority of advertising appeals to

people on the basis of the kinds of desires for freedom and self realization that the Unabomber is talking about.

So we feel like is a certain number of conscious supporters, a lot of people who are very interested, and then a lot of people who are unconsciously connected to our campaign. And our tactic is to make them conscious of it, and make that act of liberation, actually going into the voting booth and actually freeing themselves that way.

We got a letter from someone who said I have never in my life voted, I never wanted to vote, and for the first time, I want to vote, I have a reason to vote, would you please put on your web page how I can register to vote. And that is stuff we are working to do.

Extra!: Why do you want the Unabomber to be president? Is it just because we are in a campaign year or if we weren't would it be something different? Is that the most important thing you could think of or is it specifically him?

Korda: The Unabomber can't be president: if elected he will not serve. So obviously, this isn't about the man, it isn't about actually getting him elected. It's about creating a utopian moment. It's about creating a rupture in the media system, the system that covers the political election.

If enough people actually get out there and actually vote for the Unabomber in November, it will be a stunning moment. It will be historical. Nothing like that will have ever happened before in American history and that's what we are really shooting for.

We are trying to create a situation in which the media will have to acknowledge that it is not business as usual. That things can't go on the way they have been going on. That's why we have the three R's.

We have to reveal the resignation that people feel. People feel resigned to their technological fate. They feel dependent. They feel powerless. They feel that things can't be any other way than the way they are. They are surrounded by plastic. They are surrounded by asphalt. They are surrounded by computers. Their lives are artificial and shallow and they don't know how to change it. They feel resigned to their fate. So we have to reveal that resignation.

We have to be honest about it and then we have to try and use that resignation to *rupture* the media system, to get people to be angry about their resignation and go out there and vote for the Unabomber as an act of protest. If they do that, that would rupture the political system, the political illusion. Then we have a *rapture*, a rapturous moment. A utopian moment where people can actually permit themselves, even if it's only for a minute, to begin to imagine a society based on pleasure and freedom, rather than punishment and control and expropriation.

Extra!: If this gentleman is actually the Unabomber, he doesn't have a computer, he doesn't have a web site. Why do you guys have a web site?

Eccles: That would be like saying why did the Unabomber go to the New York Times. He's critical of the media, why would he want the New York Times to publish his manifesto?

For the very same reason, we are dealing with a control system and we are trying to crack open that control system. That control system controls our ability to, as people, communicate amongst ourselves. And we have a false dialogue imposed upon us which isn't our dialogue so that state of dependency is a problem. We use it as a tool

because that is the only way we can communicate.

We have no interest in being purists, our only interest is in winning by what ever way we can by non-violent methods.

People find it paradoxical but it's not paradoxical at all. We are using the Internet for the same reason that the Unabomber used the New York Times. Because the media is controlling the communications system. They are controlling the ideas that we are allowed to consider. It's all part of one system so that is our problem.

Our choices would be to not communicate at all or to use a system to which we've been put in forced dependency upon in order to have a dialogue. The only thing that makes it at all possible is the Unabomber's original act. The crime is what makes it possible. That's what gave us the power to communicate.

The reason that we have to use the tool of the control mechanism that we are opposing is because they have stripped us of every other means of communication. It's forced us to be dependent upon it. So we don't have a choice of another tool besides various forms of mass communications at this point.

We are on the Web to do this. We are not on the Web browsing. In fact there are lots of articles about why do computer people have so much interest in the Unabomber. And I think people forget that people who are working with computers on the Internet, these are people who are forced to spend their whole life in front of the screen. Of course they are the ones who are most interested in the Unabomber. And furthermore, half the time when they come and hit on our Web page, they do it at work.

Korda: People keep asking if we are

such luddites, if we support the Unabomber's ideas, why are we on the Internet? And the answer is, mutant times call for mutant tools. The best tools to dismantle something are the tools that were used to create it.

In this case, technological society is composed of whole layers of control and hierarchy, education, entertainment, advertising, the newspapers, the radio, the television. All of these are layers of control by which humans are adapted to technological society. Psychiatry is another layer of control. People are actually encouraged to accept themselves, to accept their fate, to be resigned.

So we feel that the best way to attack these layers of control is to use them against themselves. That's why we try and engage you, the media. We try and engage the media and transmit messages that are essentially viruses. These are messages that are antithetical to the whole corporate system of control.

Extra!: Why would people support the Unabomber?

Eccles: I'm glad that people ask that question. And it's a question that we ask ourselves. They should sit down and ask themselves, why am I being presented with certain deaths and not others. For instance, when our enslavement to the automobile means that every year there are going to more cases of deadly skin cancer, auto fatalities, death from stress, from working, deaths from eating high fat foods, from a sedentary lifestyle. Is there any place that those deaths are ever counted? And because they are never counted, they are anonymous. We subject ourselves to an anonymous serial killer. If you took that anonymous serial killer, that technological system with corporations, you would find that the Unabomber's killing would be nothing next to that.

Extra!: How do you explain that to a kid in eighth grade?

Eccles: I have no problem. Eighth graders understand this campaign immediately. We have no problem with young people. They understand that we are dealing with their future. The best person for this campaign is someone just out of college and realizing that they are supposed to give up the rest of their lives for something meaningless, in order to further a system that is drawing us to extinction.

I mean basically technology is the opposite of adaption. I mean normally what animals do is they adapt themselves to live harmoniously with the environment they are in. And what man has done is created technology which is a counter-adaption to the earth. It's a system of conquest and we are getting to the end of that now.

We are getting to the point where we are going to make ourselves extinct because we are unwilling to adapt to our environment. It's a collision course and people can either say we are going to remain on this path and create a bigger and bigger artificial environment or they can take the opposite path and say no, we are going to try and live in equilibrium and harmony with the earth.

But there is no middle ground, there is too much denial going on. People can push out of their minds uncomfortable truths, but we are on cars to the death camps and we're not willing to talk about it.

Extra!: Could you get the person who is whistling? Someone is whistling! These are great answers but the reality is this is probably going to be a two minute piece.

Camera Person: Try and shrink the length of your answers a little bit.

Extra!: Lydia, you just talked about a collision course, do you think it is too late, is there any point, why bother?

Eccles: I don't think it is too late at all. As long as we are in a trance, as long as we are in a collective trance, it is too late. But if we can make a rupture...I'm a very hopeful person and this whole campaign is about the opportunity that the Unabomber created. That is exciting.

Extra!: How's that sound in the background? We'll just have to deal with it. We are in a cafe.

(a lengthy discussion about B-roll and production issues)

Korda: I have something I want to add.

Extra!: We'll get to that, keep it in your mind. We probably pulled something from the wire on you right?

Korda: We sent you a press release.

Mass High Tech: What's your interest in this? Why did you come here to interview these folks?

Extra!: Because it's my job.

MHT: But what's your personal interest in this?

Extra!: It's my job. I'd be in New Hampshire skiing if this were not my job.

MHT: You have no personal interest in this?

Extra!: No, I'm just a reporter.

Korda: We should tell you about our reporter self-help group.

Extra!: Reporter self-help group.

MHT: How long have you been reporting?

Extra!: About two years.

MHT: Do you like it?

Extra!: Yes.

MHT: Is this one of the more interesting stories that you have done?

Extra!: No. I'm an entertainment reporter.

MHT: And this isn't entertainment?

Extra!: Well, I normally do actors. That's my thing. I'm an actress. We have to get on with this because they have only booked these people for half a day.

END

1) When did you decide to get the referent of COE? And Why?

In 1992.

2) When did you start to produce electronic music?

Also in 1992.

3) Had you produce music before you become a referent?

Yes.

4) Which part take the music in the COE? Is it just for fun or a part of publicity/propaganda?

Neither. It's a expression of my divine purpose.

5) Can you tell us about the message of the new album?

Our global, industrial prison-state has six billion inmates, consumes unimaginable quantities of minerals, plants, and animals, and vomits a toxic soup of death into every remote cavity of this once-flourishing planet.

6) What is the Church of Euthanasia?

The Church of Euthanasia (CoE) is a nonprofit religious order dedicated to restoring balance between humans and the remaining species on Earth through voluntary population reduction. The CoE is recognized by the US government as a tax-exempt educational foundation; contributions are tax-deductible. The Church has only one commandment, and it is "Thou Shalt Not Procreate." Membership implies a lifetime vow to never have children. The vow is irrevocable: a member who becomes pregnant or causes a pregnancy must obtain an abortion or be excommunicated. There are currently over 250 official members, mostly in the US, though there are many more members who choose not to register themselves for personal reasons.

7) What means the reduction about the essential?

No idea. Maybe you can tell me.

8) Why do you believe in autoreduction of the mankind?

None of this is my fault, it's not me, it's the bad ugly stupid people, clogging up my drains with their turds, consuming and procreating and breathing my air, my precious air that's meant for me, me and the other good intelligent sensitive well-educated clever articulate people, God's chosen people, the master race, we mustn't let these morons, these cretins, these useless cocksucking niggers inherit the earth! Outbreed them, more eggs, more sacred white patriarchal sperm, spurting into the fertile cunts of perfectly-formed aryan poetesses, we won't stop until everyone on

earth thinks like us, total control, boxcars full of stupid people, gas them like Jews, in ovens of fast-food restaurants, eat them, make them into lampshades, an army of babies, with my baby leading them, the new messiah, ripping, tearing the mutant TV-watching shit-babies into pieces, baby arms and legs in piles, triumph of Shakespeare and Descartes and Plato, swells of Handel and Bach, victory.

9) What means: Save the planet, kill yourself!

Greetings. We are not of this planet. We do not understand. Your strange customs. Your planet's ecosystem. Is failing. Your leaders deny this. Explain. Your leaders deny this. Your leaders deny this. Your leaders deny this. Why. Do you your leaders lie to you? Why. Do so many of you believe these lies?

10) Do think that the people believe in the COE, because they got only a few hundert members in a country with population of a quarter billion.

Some believe, some don't. I don't say these things because people believe in me, I say them because they're true.

11) Do you think that you come from an other planet, may be from heaven with an instruction from God! Do you believe in God?

Hear me brethren, God needs warm bodies, right now! God wants us to have more babies than fingers! God wants us to fuck like bunnies until there's no room for anything else, not even animals! God doesn't love animals! God wants us to push the cows and pigs and chickens into the sea, and still keep on fucking, until there's no more space left on Earth, until we tear into each other's flesh like rats in a cage, because GOD LOVES PEOPLE!

12) You told the spiegel-magazin that the COE your personal life support system. I think this is egoistical, what about the other members?. Can you agree that opinion?

Any organization that can't support its director is not likely to be successful. If I had spent the last eight years working, I would have come home exhausted every night and the Church wouldn't even exist. The Church--and my music--will be successful only if have enough time to work on them.

13) Can you give me a statement about war? Especially to the Kosovo-war!

Don't forget the real business of the War is buying and selling. The murdering and the violence are self-policing, and can be entrusted to non-professionals. The mass nature of wartime death is useful in many ways. It serves as Spectacle, as diversion from the real movements of the War. It provides raw material to be recorded in History, so that children may be taught History as

sequences of violence, battle after battle, and be more prepared for the adult world. (Thomas Pynchon)

14) Why didn't you decide to go into an monastery, because as a monk you would leave the world without father a child.

Priests have sex with boys, and almost never have babies. This is good. Catholic priests also eat the flesh and drink the blood of Jesus. This is very good. Everything else they do is wrong however. They are against euthanasia (mercy killing), abortion, sex-education, contraception, and sexual pleasure. They hate their bodies, which smell, get hungry, have sexual urges, and remind them of death. Because they deny death, and imagine they are going to heaven, they don't really care what happens on earth. Catholicism and technological utopianism are both forms of escapism, rejections of the terms of life and death on Earth. The CoE is anti-human, embraces the biological, and defines evolution towards diversity as the ultimate ethical good. The CoE seizes the term "pro-life", and defines itself as a truly pro-life religion.

15) They didn't you decide to live without having sex (maybe like a religious man)? Is it correct that the difference between the hardliner protestants and the COE is the sexual fun.

The Founding Fathers of this great nation made laws to protect us against men and women who use their sex organs for lewd, disgusting perversions instead of procreation. God doesn't like people who masturbate, or engage in unnatural acts, with members of the same sex no less! God hates these wicked people, and strikes them down with terrible diseases like herpes and AIDS! They are even lower than animals, almost as low as abortionists, and the Founding Fathers knew this and created sodomy laws so these foul creatures could be safely locked away, or killed like rabid dogs. Don't let it happen to you! Would you rather rot in a filthy jail cell, or follow the path of righteousness? Would you rather roast in the electric chair, or help build the new Jerusalem? You know the answer, so what are you waiting for? Put your sex organs to work for Jesus!

16) What is the sense of life?

In the words of Frank Herbert, "[the aim of life] is simple: to maintain and produce coordinated patterns of greater and greater diversity. Life improves the closed system's capacity to sustain life. Life--all life--is in the service of life." By contrast, modern humans are clearly not in the service of life: the birthplaces of civilization are mostly deserts now.

Humans turn the plants and animals that are useful to them into monocultures, identical even at the genetic level. This process of impoverishment is the opposite of evolution, and is correctly termed "devolution." Species are selected not because they stand the test of time, but for immediate economic gain. The average

person takes a drive in the countryside, sees mile after mile of corn fields, and thinks "how pleasant to be away from the city." In fact he is witnessing a holocaust, in which countless species have been exterminated to make room for one genetic organism.

The assault on biological diversity has been paralleled by an equal assault on social diversity. Where there were once thousands of tribal nations in America, each with their own way of living uniquely adapted to their circumstances, now there is only one nation, and only one way to live. Like the dozens of species that become extinct every day as the tropical rainforest disappears, the diversity of culture also disappears, to be replaced by standardized humans, who only know shopping malls and discotheques.

Having evolved on the Earth, but no longer *of* the Earth, drawing a distinction between themselves and every other form of life, domesticated humans emerge as the super-weed, capable of adapting rapidly to the hostile urban environments that their technologies create. The next step towards a desert planet is a planet of weeds, on which only rats, roaches, pigeons, and humans survive, slurping the thin gruel of civilization.

17) Why do you sponsor sexual methods?

Pleasure is forbidden, at the earliest age, and all throughout the process of adapting you to prison-state. You obey the false self, you become model prisoners, and you succeed. You've all succeeded, you've all been model prisoners. You owe yourselves... A round of applause. Let's approve of ourselves, let's appreciate ourselves, just for surviving it. Just for becoming model prisoners, and surviving it. Because we didn't have any choice. Let's not indulge in false idealism, let's not think that we could have been better somehow and beaten them, that as six-year-olds or eight-year-olds we could have risen up and smashed the prison-state, no, no. There was no escape. You did what you had to do, even if it meant crushing other, smaller people around you, your classmates, your little brothers and sisters, you had to do it. We had to embody authority, we had to become our aggressors, so let's take a moment and approve of ourselves, for surviving it, with some degree of our integrity intact, somewhere in there, some compassion, some ability to love. Maybe stunted and disfigured, but some part of you survived this process, enough so that you can listen to me deconstruct all this for you, and take you back through it. There's some part of you that I'm speaking to now, that's bitterly weeping and saying "Yes! Yes, this happened to me! This happened to me! I went through this. I suffered this." Let's have a moment of silence for that part of you, the primal self that could have been, if it hadn't been stunted, and mutated, and denigrated, and suppressed, by the brute force of the false self.

18) How think you about suicide? Why didn't you kill yourself as a sign for your conviction?

Every person has the absolute right to choose the time and place of their death. I think about suicide all the time and probably will kill myself some day. But maybe if enough people listen me and stop turning the earth into a toilet, I won't need to kill myself.

19) What can everybody do that we can live together in peace!

Don't make any babies. Ever. For your whole life. Also buy less, make less, do less, and learn to live with less. If there is ever a year when humans grow less food, or make less cars and computers and shopping malls and parking lots, or burn less oil, or use less paper and plastic than the year before, maybe there will be some hope for peace.

20) Do you have sex with men or women, because you said that you are a transgendered person.

I have sex with people because I like them, not because of what kind of genitals they have. Being transgendered means balancing our male and female aspects, and rejecting the artificial gender roles that are forced on us by modern society. The world is out of balance, because humans are out of balance, with the world, with each other, and within themselves. To become transgendered is to start the healing process where it has to start, within yourself.

21) What do you think about the "chinese method" of autoreducing: every family have got the right to have one child. this method will halve the population within one generation...

It won't work. The results will be female infanticide on a massive scale--resulting in a serious excess of males--followed by a birth boom after the failure is officially recognized. Restoring balance requires the active participation of every person. This is why the CoE only supports voluntary population reduction. Control is industrial society's obsession, not ours, and we reject it. We don't attempt to change the course of industrial society, which would be impossible anyway. Instead we encourage individuals to secede, refuse to participate, drop out, create hidden worlds.

People become more conservative after having children: they move to the suburbs, go into lifelong debt to buy houses and cars, support the police to protect their property and community standards. People who don't have children have less resistance to change, less attachment to industrial society. We provoke, to create the right conditions for a leap of consciousness.

22) an utopia: the CoE stands for ethics right opinion and the mankind will definitiv reduced. When will we get the right back to have babies?

In general, when we begin to live in a sustainable way. The background rate of species extinction is approximately one species from any major group every million years. By contrast, modern industrial humans are currently exterminating a species every fifteen minutes. When species extinction drops back down to the background rate, we can have babies again. In practice this means many generations without babies, particularly in the industrial nations. The United States and Europe, for example, should reduce their populations by a factor of ten to account for the ecological devastation they are causing.

23) What do you think about the Love Parade?

The Love Parade is clear example of globalism. Its totalitarian slogan--"One World, One Future"--could easily have been lifted from Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World." A million standardized humans gathered around a phallic DJ tower, worshipping at the altar of homogenized techno-rave culture, resembles nothing so much as a scene from "Triumph of the Will," and I said so, on VIVA, the German equivalent of MTV.

24) When and where will you play next time in Germany or Europe?

At WMF in Berlin, on Sunday July 11.

1. Lets begin with the music. How do came in contact to electronic music?

I started playing piano and guitar in 1977, first studying rock, and later jazz. I studied music theory for many years, with several excellent teachers including the tenor player Jerry Bergonzi. In the late eighties I played in a swing band, a fusion band, a psychedelic rock band, performed solo guitar in restaurants and on the street, and taught at a small music school.

My greatest musical inspirations were--and still are--John Abercrombie (especially his collaborations with Jan Hammer) and Ralph Towner, as well as Art-Rock bands such as Pink Floyd and Yes. My first exposure to electronic music was the work of Vangelis. In 1991, I began crossdressing, and moved to Provincetown to pursue a career as a "Paris is Burning"-style female impersonator, but I couldn't compete with the bitchy street divas who had nothing to fall back on but hooking or drug-dealing.

I was exposed to house and deep-house, and was especially moved by the soulful quality of Black Box's "Dreamland". Later, Robin S. and Orb also made an big impression on me. I started making electronic music in 1993: "I Just Can't Let Go" is one of my earliest tracks and clearly shows the influence of house music. At this time I also released my first CD, a frightening and starkly beautiful ambient sound collage called "Demons In My Head".

2. Why haven't you choose to do rock or punk, where vocals, disruptions, propaganda and education play a big role (or is it too normal for you in the rock business trying to push borders (e.g. Marilyn Manson)) ?

Electronic dance music is a widely accepted form of propaganda, and conveys content easily, providing the music is skillfully created. I don't identify with tired cliches such as rock or punk, which mass-market fake rebellion to teenagers. The goals of industrial society--industrialism, globalism, control--have not changed, nor will they ever change. I persuade individuals to reduce their dependence on industrial society--by not having children, for example--as a first step towards removing themselves from it completely. I am against politics, so for me, the apolitical nature of the techno scene is an asset, not a weakness.

Voting in elections only legitimates the political process, which can't be separated from industrialism. To destroy industrial society, we need to lose all political illusions, build small autonomous local structures, and transform ourselves on an individual basis.

3. The vocals (sentences) have been cutted, stretched, pulled together and create after a certain time the whole meaning. What was the aim behind this kind of process? Where did you take the voices from?

Repetition is highly effective in propaganda, and therefore overused. The vocal technique you refer to--best illustrated by

"Victim of Leisure"--enhances and disguises the repetition by revealing the meaning only gradually. This creates tension and curiosity in the listener, and sustains interest, while the repetition operates on a subliminal level.

The voices are provided by Church members. Many of the tracks on the CD grew out of vocal loops used at Church actions, such as human meat taste-tests in front of supermarkets, a fetus barbecue at a pro-life rally (featuring doctors with gunshot wounds), and an assault on a sperm bank with a 15-foot-tall foaming penis.

4. In how far do you take your musical releases as a kind of propaganda?

5. Don't you think you amuse the people with your music, which couldn't be really one of your aims, because this feeling makes lifetime even longer. Aren't you a "trader of amusement"?

My music is only effective as propaganda if it amuses people. Boring propaganda doesn't work. The Unabomber is good example of this. His 30,000-word manifesto was beautifully reasoned, but had zero entertainment value, other than a certain dry sense of humor. Most people skipped it and read the sports section instead.

6. In some statements you use polarization as propagandistic tool. Why do you think our society just understand and reflect crass statements.

The Church of Euthanasia's activities often appear nonsensical or provocative. This results from a deliberate strategy, rooted in Dadaism and other anti-art movements, and based on the historical observation that paradox is the best antidote to totalitarianism. When everything is clearly defined, assimilated, and organized into dualisms (right, wrong, good, evil) or neat categories (work, progress, art, etc.) there is no possibility for original thought or meaningful communication. This is of course why successful totalitarian movements seek to control the appearance of reality through propaganda. The collapse of the Soviet regime can be seen from this point of view as a propaganda failure: physical coercion is simply not cost-effective.

The more sophisticated methods of advertising, education, and voluntary self-censorship have proved their effectiveness in the US and Europe. These techniques require a highly competitive society in which literally everything is reduced to commodity, including not only the physical (land, water, air, the electromagnetic spectrum) and the biological (plants, animals, genetic material, sexual pleasure) but also more abstract entities such as entertainment, information, and ideas in general. Because a commodity-based society is so highly interdependent, even small disruptions are intolerable. Its members must be specialized, and adapted to constant technological change. Conformity is achieved with deep, life-long conditioning, but at a high price: the subjects develop attention disorders, lose the ability to reflect,

and become unable to face psychological conflict. Ambiguity and confusion are therefore the CoE's most powerful weapons: confronted with paradoxes which shatter their convenient fictions, people are forced to think for themselves.

7. Is music for you just a propagandistic thing in our one-dimensional covered media-scene (advertising+content...), or do you have ambitions to be especially honored as an innovative techno-producer?

I enjoy making music. Not all of my music is propaganda, and not all of my propaganda is music. My main ambition is to provoke a leap of consciousness to *species awareness*, in which people become aware of belonging to a species: the human species, housed among a (shrinking) number of other species on which their lives depend. Each person is different, so it's hard to generalize, but in my experience, a decision to never have children indicates good progress towards this leap of consciousness.

8. Sometimes you refer to the Unabomber. In how far is physical force (R.A.F....) important to reach your political aims?

The Unabomber was fighting a guerilla war against the media system, represented not only by the corporate fortresses of the New York Times and the Washington Post, but also by thousands of lesser protectors of the status quo. His strategy was to blackmail the media into publishing what would otherwise be unpublishable: a 30,000 word indictment of every aspect of the technological state, including specific advice on how best to destroy it, in what may prove to be its only moment of weakness. He chose his victims carefully for their symbolic value, leaving the media with little choice but to publish his manifesto, footnotes and all. It can be argued that his strategy was failure. The manifesto was too long for his audience, and the media portrayed him as a mere serial killer, despite his academic credentials. From this point of view even the relatively incoherent efforts of the Church of Euthanasia are more effective, because they are disguised as entertainment and therefore sell themselves easily without the need for blackmail.

Personally, I have neither the skill nor the disposition to be a successful guerilla, and in any case I'm already too well-known. I encourage voluntary population reduction in my official capacity, but as a private citizen, I applaud the courage and tenacity of those who do battle with the technological state, and occasionally win small victories, against impossible odds. American criticism of the Unabomber's violence seems especially surreal at this moment, as our B-52s reduce the urban population of former Yugoslavia to stone-age conditions.

9. In the text about CoE you have written about repetitious music... and a mass-produced-hypnosis no longer seems shocking because it has already happened. In how far do you differ except the statements. Or are you using the same tools which you seem to

hate? Isn't it kind of contradictory?

Only barefoot Indians in the woods have the right to denounce the ugliness of industrial society. Those of us who have access to mass media are tainted by it, and should therefore keep our mouths shut. Nonsense! The tools that were used to make something are also the best tools for dismantling it. Our global, industrial prison-state has six billion inmates, consumes unimaginable quantities of minerals, plants, and animals, and vomits a toxic soup of death into every remote cavity of this once-flourishing planet. The beast is howling and growing larger every second. To think that such a monstrous reality can be affected by hiding in the wilderness--or what's left of it--is simply naive.

10. In times of war it's even more difficult to understand the different aim between genocide (euthanasia) methods through missiles or a holocaust by a fascist leader and your demand of a smaller world population with the understandable point of saving the biological diversity. One could estimate that it is a welcomed political problem for you because the population reduces itself through wars. Isn't war kind of a anti-humanistic thing and doesn't the NATO act in a so-called and a wannabe global mission? Where is the border for you? Don't nationalistic countries handle under your acceptance? And what's about economy-war without clear borders and countries?

Historically, wars are a totally ineffective form of population reduction, because they are followed not only by birth booms, but also by industrial reconstruction and economic growth, as for example in Germany and Japan. Modern wars are fought with the cooperation of the industrial powers, and can be seen as spasms of technological and economic growth. As Thomas Pynchon says,

"Don't forget the real business of the War is buying and selling. The murdering and the violence are self-policing, and can be entrusted to non-professionals. The mass nature of wartime death is useful in many ways. It serves as Spectacle, as diversion from the real movements of the War. It provides raw material to be recorded in History, so that children may be taught History as sequences of violence, battle after battle, and be more prepared for the adult world."

War also causes unacceptable damage to wilderness, unless it's restricted to biological weapons that only affect humans, but this is missing the larger point. War is not the exception, but the rule, the very essence of industrialism. Production and consumption combine, at the highest level of efficiency, into a single process of disintegration. What made the Holocaust so shocking was that the camps and railroad cars were so familiar, so ordinary: the same techniques had been applied to animals for a century, and are still in use today. In the United States for example, we slaughter more than one billion animals a year, often in "factory farms" that look suspiciously like Dachau.

I don't ignore the suffering of the Jews. My point is simply that today, there are still Jews, perhaps not so many in Europe, but certainly in the United States. To put it crassly, as a race, and as a culture, the Jews grew back. The millions of non-human species that we've exterminated in the last 500 years, don't grow back. They can't grow back, because they are extinct, really gone, forever. No one builds memorials for them, because the species holocaust isn't remote history, it's the present, it's happening now, as you read this. Where the Nazis failed, industrial society is succeeding, exterminating an entire species every fifteen minutes, day after day, year after year, faster and faster. As with the Jewish holocaust, most people don't want to know, because knowing would mean living with shame. Yet only by facing the shame, do we go forward, and take responsibility for changing the situation. Germans faced their shame with anti-nationalism; I face my shame with anti-humanism. That's what the Church of Euthanasia really is: an organization for people who are willing to face the shame of being human.

11. Have you maybe heard of the belgian chicken scandal? They fed the chickens with some antitobacco-mixtures and all animals were dioxin poisoned. The total horror. Could you please write a nice non-meat recipe for our readers.

Again, it's not the exception, it's THE RULE. This is happening all the time. The only difference is, this time, you know about it. I walk into a food market. I'm surrounded by genetically weakened, depleted, enriched, preserved, packaged, poisoned food. Why is organic food so expensive? Because it's less poisonous. Maybe. Why do I pay to drink bottled water? Because it's less poisonous. Maybe. I am poisoned. You are poisoned. We are living in a poisoned world. The toilet goes somewhere. Where does it go? Don't just sit there acting shocked and surprised. Make the connection. "Dirty air, dirty water, dirty the minds of men." (Kurosawa).

12. DNS-manipulation is a busy discussed theme here in europe. What's about the states and what is your own opinion or own horror-scenario?

In the words of Frank Herbert, "[the aim of life] is simple: to maintain and produce coordinated patterns of greater and greater diversity. Life improves the closed system's capacity to sustain life. Life--all life--is in the service of life." By contrast, modern humans are clearly not in the service of life: the birthplaces of civilization are mostly deserts now.

Humans turn the plants and animals that are useful to them into monocultures, identical even at the genetic level. This process of impoverishment is the opposite of evolution, and is correctly termed "devolution." Species are selected not because they stand the test of time, but for immediate economic gain. The average person takes a drive in the countryside, sees mile after mile of corn fields, and thinks "how pleasant to be away from the city."

In fact he is witnessing a holocaust, in which countless species have been exterminated to make room for one genetic organism.

The assault on biological diversity has been paralleled by an equal assault on social diversity. Where there were once thousands of tribal nations in America, each with their own way of living uniquely adapted to their circumstances, now there is only one nation, and only one way to live. Like the dozens of species that become extinct every day as the tropical rainforest disappears, the diversity of culture also disappears, to be replaced by standardized humans, who only know shopping malls and discotheques.

Having evolved on the Earth, but no longer *of* the Earth, drawing a distinction between themselves and every other form of life, domesticated humans emerge as the super-weed, capable of adapting rapidly to the hostile urban environments that their technologies create. The next step towards a desert planet is a planet of weeds, on which only rats, roaches, pigeons, and humans survive, slurping the thin gruel of civilization.

13. What other kind of being you would like to be?

A tree, in a forest.

15. Are you a positive or negative minded person?

I strive for balance, with not so much success.

16. Please create your own positive futuristic vision and a wishable lifeform for the next centuries based on a anti-humanistic, anti-nationalistic pattern.

I focus primarily on population rather than consumption. It's also true that my message is only received by the technological elite of the industrial nations--your readers?--who are leading the charge, in terms of consumption. So the real question is, since most of the industrial nations are approaching population stability anyway, why do I focus on population?

Suppose you're a "good consumer." Let's say you recycle, buy "green" products, avoid meat, donate to environmental causes, and so on. You even limit yourself to one child, and you're determined to raise the child with values similar to yours, ensuring that he or she will carry on the good work of saving the earth for future generations. Now let's just say, for arguments' sake, that your child rebels against your middle-class, intellectual, politically correct conditioning, and winds up swilling beer in a trailer park, with three kids. It happens. And what guarantee do we have that those three kids are going follow in your noble footsteps? None whatsoever. Let's say one rises above his humble roots and becomes an investment banker, with a Porche, a house in the suburbs, a barbecue grill, and two fashionably dressed children. Another runs off with a biker,

moves to a nearby trailer park, and produces less trendy children who also enjoy barbecued meat. The third becomes a priest and only has sex with boys--a partial success anyway.

Guess what? You just wiped out all the gain from your recycling, "green" consuming, tofu-eating, and tax-deductible contributions. Not only did you wipe it out, you reversed it, many times over. How did it happen? It happened because individual consumption affects the future *linearly*, while procreation affects it *exponentially*. The impact of a single child on future generations can't even be approximated, because there are too many variables. It should be obvious by now why I'm advocating voluntary population reduction in the industrial nations. I'm advocating it because it's the only way the current generation can affect the distant future. It's just too late--way too late--for cutting back on consumption and hoping for the best. We can no longer afford to gamble on something as tenuous as the transmission of values from parents to children. We need to reduce the number of Americans, Europeans, and Japanese, as soon as possible, by at least a factor of ten, no matter what.

I also believe it's unreasonable to demand that people abandon all of their social conditioning at once. It's not just a question of giving up convenience. If you're reading this, you've probably learned only the skills that are useful to industrial society--mathematics, logic, reading, writing, analysis, and so forth--and have absorbed the esthetics of industrial society--such as they are--in the process. I'm no exception to this. I identify strongly with technical culture, because it's all I know. If I were suddenly transported to the wilderness, I would go crazy. No amount of wishing would make me a tribal person, raised by oral tradition to love wilderness and survive in it easily. Deprived of usefulness, my experience would be similar to that of elderly people confined in nursing homes.

By comparison, not having children is hardly even a sacrifice. The decline of birth rates in the industrial countries only proves this point. Most people I know are much too busy answering e-mail and updating their web pages to raise children, even if they were willing to give up so much of their disposable income. It's possible that the elite will prove self-eliminating, in a kind of reverse Darwinism: population reduction via hedonism and sheer selfishness. From this point of view, I'm simply encouraging an existing trend, a reasonable strategy in any situation.

From dh016@torfree.net Thu Jun 24 11:19:23 1999

Dear Chris, I recently was sent an article on genetically altered crops & info on the COE world tour. Thanks. I'm sending my interview questions as I wanna use the info you sent me the last time as a separate overview for my zine. I hope you don't mind but I feel you can answer some of my questions more specifically here. All I hope for is that you can get back to me when you can & keep these questions on file if it will be sometime til I next here from you.

1. Do you think your appearance on Jerry Springer a few years ago was a success? You had Springer taking cheap shot jokes & Pastor Kim antagonizing the audience but that still amounts to exposure. Do you see bad publicity as good publicity?
2. With a lot of your marches/protests/rallys it seems that COE members, rather than remain in one visible camp, like to disperse & intermingle w/ opposition - sometimes to the point of being unable to tell who's who. Does this confusion help to clarify your message when it comes to confrontation?
3. Can you tell us about your background & how you came to be w/ the COE?
4. The overriding function of the COE is population control thru the 4 pillars of suicide/euthanasia, abortion, cannibalism & sodomy. What proposals/ functions has COE made to making these pillars a reality?
5. Have there been any Church activities that you've regretted employing? Has there ever been any news coverage or police confrontations resulting in real negativity?
6. In the case of ex-COE members who've left, what reasons have they cited?
7. How much of the COE is a multi-racial & female background and what are your stances on racism & feminism? Has COE ever been accused of being derogatory or sexist?
8. Not too long ago you were involved in trying to raise a suicide assistance hotline. What became of that & how did you get involved in billboard sabotage/manipulation?
9. Some people view the COE as nothing but a collection of sexual deviants (largely thru some of your colorful signs). What are your views on pornography, prostitution & homosexuality?
10. What do you think of the Promise Keepers & Christian Coalition and how often do you run into religious fundamentalism?
11. If the COE was to expand into smaller branches, could it really gain a prominent foothold say in Canada as much as Europe?

12. Do you have any final words?

And there you have it Chris. I really hope you can respond & hope you can get back to me.

Thanks & looking forward to hearing from you, Hamish

"Purity is for losers": The Church of Euthanasia and The Chris Korda Interview by Chad Parenteau

Introduction

"The Church of Euthanasia was inspired by a dream, in which Rev. Chris Korda confronted an alien intelligence known as The Being who speaks for the inhabitants of Earth in other dimensions. The Being warned that our planet's ecosystem is failing, and that our leaders deny this. The Being asked why our leaders lie to us, and why so many of us believe these lies. Rev. Korda awoke from the dream moaning the Church's infamous slogan, Save the Planet - Kill Yourself." --From The Church of Euthanasia web site.

Headed by Korda, who resides in Somerville, MA, the Church of Euthanasia, a federally recognized and therefore tax-exempt educational group, preaches biodiversity and the willful depopulation of the Earth in order to save its many species from extinction. They have one commandment, "Thou Shalt Not Procreate," and four pillars: suicide, abortion, cannibalism, and sodomy (which they define as any nonreproductive sex). Potential "Euthanists" only have to adhere to the COE commandment, adopting if children are later desired. Members with children are excommunicated only if they give birth to more after joining.

Actions have included counterattacking an abortion clinic protest with signs that say "Eat a Queer Fetus For Jesus" and "Pedophile Priests For Life," to holding blind flesh taste tests outside a supermarket (They profess to be vegetarians, and suggest the eating of already deceased humans for those who insist on eating flesh). Their comparatively subtler efforts that have more entertainment value receive more mainstream coverage than their demonstrations. These include Korda's techno CD's and their print/E-journal, *Snuff It*, hailed by *Time* magazine in 1995 as one of the "Hot 'zines on the web."

All press to the COE is good press. A part of their web site lists all the articles ever written about the church, whether they are objective or with a negative bent. Korda told me he has nothing to hide and even challenged others to dig dirt up on him. It isn't easy tracking down information; and when you find it, there isn't much his web site doesn't already tell you. He is the son of Simon & Schuster editor-in-chief Michael Korda, whose own father helped to establish the British film industry. He started experimenting with gender roles less than ten years ago. For those who have encountered Korda, all this seems to be common knowledge; you just won't get it directly out of his mouth--not if you're writing about him, at least.

Some might say it was his father's lawyer that stopped him from talking (as claimed in a gossip column of a 1996 issue of *New York* magazine). A year after, however, Korda--who was "Chrissy" Korda at the time, and asked writers to refer to him as a her--talked at length in *Boston* magazine about his family and his past with no apparent reluctance. Recently, he informed Mark Dery, who interviewed him for the online magazine *GettingIt* that he is both Chris and Chrissy. Despite this, the Korda I've witnessed these past few months has seemed decisively male and gave me no requests to refer to him as a her. What happened between then and

now (to me at least) is a mystery. According to Korda, his past is not as important as his self-anointed mission.

Korda expressed disappointment that when the COE is given any significant space in a periodical, it's done with an A&E slant. An ideal situation, said Korda, would be a trial over a suicide inspired by the church, something the area's premiere paper and other mainstream press would have no choice but to report. Their web site not only offers advice, but sainthood to anyone who commits suicide and mentions the COE, be it in a positive or negative light. "Provided they don't do it for some really asinine reason," added Korda.

"It's been a disappointment to me that no one's actually killed themselves and then had their parents sue us," Korda told me in the course of our interviews. "That would actually punch through the media shield."

An intended visualization for this piece came after my interviews with Korda. After he sent me a taped copy, I sat down to watch the episode of *The Jerry Springer Show* that he and other members appeared in over two years ago under the title "I Want To Join A Suicide Cult." The guest roster included a woman named Grace, who said she wished to join, and an ex-boyfriend, Chuck, who wanted to stop her.

As they reported on their web-site, one of the main goals was to attack Neal Horsley, head of the Creator Rights Party, whose own web-site, which applauded the persecution and murder of doctors who perform abortions, was shut down earlier this year. Watching this, I felt it was an even bigger set-up then they let on. Chuck, who said he split with Grace over her refusal to have children and didn't want to wear condoms because they were monogamous, was too perfect a foil. Grace's decision and Chuck's struggle to win her back both seemed non-existent except through Springer's monologue.

The kicker was when Springer gave what I thought was the answer to his own question of why they acted the way they did.

"Grace, in fairness, if [don't populate the planet] is all you guys were saying, you wouldn't even be on the show because that wouldn't be a major issue and people would be agreeing with you."

Korda chimed in: "That's right, and isn't that interesting, Jerry?"

Grace got up from chair and walked to the edge of the stage, sounding charged up: "Wait. You got it. Jerry, that's exactly it, Jerry!"

It was then that I remembered "A Modest Proposal," the satirical essay written by Jonathan Swift in 1729, often evoked in articles about the COE. In it, Swift, with statistics and cold logic, proposes that Ireland (his homeland) cure it's famine simply by eating their infants. This essay, when read in a teacher's class I was in, sparked such debate that one of my fellow students even said she didn't think it was satire at all, and that Swift was dead serious.

Good God, that's it. This is what the church is about. They have the modest proposal for the upcoming twenty-first century. At least, that's what I thought to myself. Being able to view the COE

material in a certain context, I had at least a clearer vision of how the article would end.

By July, I found a newly posted letter from someone who announced a pending suicide. The letter closed with the following: "Thanks for the support, not that you convinced me, but I appreciate the camaraderie."

I had no proof of its authenticity when I discovered it. Still, it floored me, witnessing satire becoming dogma, if it hadn't been already.

When I first heard of them, it was through writer and 'zine publisher Reverend Richard J. Mackin, who described them to me as a "street theater group." *The Jerry Springer Show* described them as a suicide cult, much to the objections of fellow-guest Grace, who was inducted after the show. "You called it, 'I Want to Join a Suicide Cult,'" she told Springer. "I'm joining an educational group that's talking about overpopulation."

Korda's response when I asked him about it: "Of course we're a suicide cult."

Throughout our talks, Korda made it clear that he and the COE strive, among everything else, towards ambiguity, and to not be defined as any one thing. As of this writing, Korda has accomplished that much.

A Day In The Life

April 24, 1999. The Boston light radio station, WBOS, held another "Earthfest" at Boston's Esplanade near the Charles River, featuring an unexciting array of musicians. I hadn't come for any of this, but in fact was searching for the familiar banners of the COE, who were ejected from last year's Earthfest. After breezing past the various environmental booths, I headed down towards the River's edge and the concert stage, which the various concession stands (serving hot dogs, doughboys and other foods questionable by environmental and vegetarian standards) were next to. The tables stacked with environmental literature were a considerable distance away from the musical hoopla and placed under large tents that had all the visual allure of the hospital tents you see in war movies.

Down by the river, I found the first vestiges of the COE gathering. Young men and women by or on the docks, sporting signs with such sayings as NO ONE REALLY CARES, THANK YOU FOR NOT BREEDING and MAKE LOVE NOT BABIES.

One the water, a woman rode on a kayak with the sign, LOVE THE EARTH TIE YOUR TUBES. At one point a family walked up to the docks. A little girl in a pink-hooded jacket was in tow. One of the women, presumably the mother, pointed to it.

"See the sign?" she asked the child, presumably not being able to read it herself. The family moved away soon after I heard her say that.

More children were to come at the docks, a couple even getting close enough to one member who sported a respirator mask and the sign FEELING MATERNAL? ADOPT! I walked ahead to the loosely boarded edge to better watch and film Korda and others assemble their trademark SAVE THE PLANET KILL YOURSELF banner on their makeshift raft.

"How is that saving the planet?" a kid asked me, pointing to

the banner.

I said he'd have to ask them.

The Arrival

"He's never coming back to shore ever again," one member joked. "He's becoming a pirate."

When Korda finally arrived, it was not by land but by the river, as he had promised in a press release. The attack was two-pronged. From the raft, which swayed heavily from the strong winds, the church used their sound system to voice out such mantras as "Buy. Buy. Buy. Consume," while other members and supporters stirred things up on land.

Among the supporters on land: activist Ian MacKanon, preaching free radio and passing out information on Liberation Day; COE member and self-styled clown Vermin Supreme, who sported instead of makeup, a megaphone to go with his mocking voice, taunting passerby to eat more hot dogs; and Mackin, passing out free copies of his Earthfest "Litter A Park for the Earth" issue of his 'zine *Protests Are Your Best Entertainment Value (PAYBEV)*.

(A quick aside: Supreme is possibly the second most recognizable member of the COE and has been with them almost since the beginning. "People on the street totally believe that it's real," he said, adding that he attempts to give an element of humor to the COE demonstrations for those who watch, "trying to diffuse their anger."

"Of course we are real," asserted Supreme, who also does his "political clown shtick" during elections, running for tittles he invents himself. He ran during the 1996 presidential elections for "Mayor of The Entire United States of America." He plans to run in 2000 for "Emperor for a New Millennium," pushing for mandatory tooth brushing.

"More fun than any cult you can imagine," is how he described the COE. "They just want your time.")

"The Church of Euthanasia" blared an electronic-friendly voice from the raft's speakers. "Information so powerful, you actually use less."

"They're so bad," chuckled Supreme, as he walked further away from the main body of protesters and lost himself in the crowd.

It was hard not to laugh. Especially when a powerboat started circling violently around their raft, its driver protesting the noise. This was followed by a playing of the mantra found on their dance single "Fleshdance": "Cow, Chicken, Pig, Human, What's the difference?"

The Message

The following quotes are excerpted from Korda's address from the raft to the Earthfest goers, taken from both our recordings, as Korda told me he spoke from no script.

"Let me ask you something. What does the Sheraton Hotel chain have to do with saving the earth? What does Royal Sonesta have to do with saving the earth. I know: Not much. And guess what? Royal Sonesta and Sheraton are the two biggest sponsors of the WBOS Earthfest. This has got nothing to do with the earth. This is hot dogs. This is pushing baby strollers. This is littering a park for the earth. That's stupid, and that's why we're here. We're here to tell you that the earth is dying. The planet is in trouble. This

is not a joke. We don't do this because it's fun. We do this because it's real. This is what Earth Day was supposed to be about."

"They don't like to hear what we're trying to say over at WBOS. They don't like to hear it because it might interfere with business as usual. That's what this is all about, is business as usual. Buy. Sell. Buy. Sell. More stuff. More consuming. More babies. More stuff. More production. More consumption. Well, not for us. We're drawing a line. We're saying it's got to stop at some point. It's humans versus the earth. Humans may have evolved on the Earth, but they are no longer of the earth. They draw a distinction between themselves and every other species on Earth, and that's not going to work. It's not a good strategy."

"We're here to talk to you today about the bombing of Yugoslavia. Yeah! What's that go to do with the Earth? Huh?"

"You bet it does. That's right, because Milosevic is doing his ethnic cleansing, and we're doing ours. We're cleansing species. He may kill Albanians, but we kill species."

"Make no mistake. Humans are tough. Humans are very tough. Humans are like rats, like roaches, like weeds, and that's what we're going to have if we keep on down the path we're on. We're going to have a weed planet, a depleted planet on which there is no real world left with real wealth anymore. Wealth is not measured in dollars. Wealth is not measured in office parks. Wealth is in biological diversity. We're offering biological diversity. That's what we're here for. We're standing up for biological diversity. We're standing up for the diversity of species on the Earth."

"Shut the fuck up!" yelled a passer by from the shore, once Korda finished.

"You're beautiful, dude, you're beautiful," replied Supreme, who chimed in with his megaphone once Korda finished. "Save the planet, kill yourself ... Those misguided youths in Colorado? They had half the right idea. Unfortunately, they did it in the wrong order. They should have killed themselves first. Those people in Colorado would've killed themselves first, there would have been no problem now, would there?"

Catch-Up

I arranged to meet with Korda before I could dive into the COE web site and its information, tracing from Korda's speech some paraphrasing of the Gaia Liberation Front (an organization the COE quotes but does not support because of their proposal to use involuntary virus warfare to depopulate the planet) and David Quammen's "Planet of Weeds," its full text also available through the web site. The COE dogma, however, was not what I was primarily interested in. That information was and still is readily available. I wanted to look into their strategy for spreading that information, which has received very little print in comparison to Korda's constant elaboration of the Church's commandment and four pillars.

I remembered Supreme's words about Littleton as Korda stepped in the Middle East, maybe a month after the Littleton massacre, wearing black shorts and shirt, and a long black coat, displaying his normal, unapologetic stance on issues for all to see, though

we were the only two eating at a table. When he ordered his vegetarian dish, I simply had a Coke, just to stay safe.

"The fine print is that they lied to us, as they could have been expected to do," started Korda, referring to the police. "Lieutenant Bearfield, who was the commanding officer that day told us that we had every right to do what we were doing, and that we could continue to use our sound system ... to address the crowd but that we would have to do it at the docks for our own safety because they weren't confident of the construction of our boat."

"In any case," he said, "they moved us off to one side. They towed us off to the dock, and then when we'd been on the dock for maybe ten fifteen minutes maximum--by that time the big heavyweight cops had already gone, which is stupid on our part. If we'd have been smart, we would have started broadcasting immediately, just to test their mettle."

Coincidentally, police sirens wailed past us somewhere in the background as he finished berating his own actions. "But instead we waited, just to socialize for a few minutes, cranked the sound system back up and within seconds, we had two very big state police cops on us, informing us that if we didn't turn off the sound system that they would arrest us and confiscate the sound system."

The Massachusetts Police's public relations office, who I had contacted to reach this Lt. Bearfield or anyone else who would speak on this, never got back to me.

"So there you have it," Korda began again. "It's a classic cop trick. We spent the rest of the afternoon--or I spent the rest of the afternoon--chasing down various officers, including Lt. Bearfield. I got Lt. Bearfield to reconfirm that we did have every right to use the sound system, then I tried to explain that to the officer who shut us down, but he wouldn't talk to me. Basically we had a kind of tense standoff, where the officer who wouldn't talk to me was saying, 'Lt. Bearfield's in charge. Whatever he says goes. Your issue is with him, not with me. I'm not going to talk to you.' So in effect, by not giving me any assurance that he wouldn't arrest me, they were leaving open a situation where we would turn the sound system back on, they would arrest me, I would say, 'Well, hey, you can't arrest me because Lt. Bearfield said that we could do this.' They would call up Lt. Bearfield, and Lt. Bearfield would say 'I never said that,' and we'd be arrested."

Korda said he wasn't interested in this scenario, so the matter was dropped and he and the COE left the grounds with no further problems. "All throughout the standard Church of Euthanasia policy is in effect: no one's ever been arrested at a Church of Euthanasia action, and I have no intention of starting now. Once you get arrested, the police can seriously curtail your freedom to do these things in the future."

"But on the other side of that," Korda added, "we've got real trouble with First Amendment rights in Boston and everywhere in the United States." He brought up the (selectively enforced) Park Department ordinance requiring a permit for any gathering of more than two people. "Even on the public sidewalks, where they can't get away with that, they can make you keep moving; and they can get you for obstructing traffic."

"So we've been," he explained, "in some cases, been forced to march around in circles. If we try and attach ourselves to someone else's event, for instance, like the Right to Lifers ... They can get us for interfering with the Right to Lifers' permit, or they can get us for obstructing a parade."

Although Korda conceded the futility of requesting a permit to obstruct someone else's demonstration, he said the COE plans to apply for a permit for their own parade, which is still in the planning phase. "The basic theme would be a parade to stop traffic," he said. "Of course we wouldn't advertise it as a parade to stop traffic. The city would never allow that. We would advertise it as a diversity parade, and under the banner of diversity we would try to recruit as many diverse organizations as possible, probably under some type of cover organization."

According to Korda, there's good reason for such secrecy. "I don't think there's any organizations in Boston that wholeheartedly supports us, but that's part of our position. Of course we're unpopular. What we're saying is fundamentally antisocial and antihuman. We're campaigning against five thousand years of industrialism and globalism. We're attempting to interrupt the normal flow of economics. We're against business as usual. We're against production. We're against mass society. And above all, we're against technology."

Jerry Again

"You know, I suspect most of us think this is all crazy, that these are all a bunch of loonies playing with something short of a full deck. Clearly, to the extent that these folks can influence vulnerable and impressionable minds to do destructive and harmful things, they are, of course, dangerous." --From Jerry Springer's closing statement on the COE appearance.

"First of all, it was offered to us," said Chris, after I asked him why he appeared on *Jerry Springer*, of all places. "Second of all, it does reach, predominantly, poor black women who are at home and were likely--very likely--extremely likely--to have children, so that's an important target audience for us. Third of all, I personally prefer tabloid media to so-called respectable, conventional media because tabloid media is less censored. With tabloid media, you can basically say whatever you want. The only restriction is that you can't be boring."

I brought up the fact that the "Suicide Cult" theme of the show may have distilled any environmental messages they were there to convey. For Korda, this didn't seem a concern. "We're not any one thing. We're a propaganda ministry. We do whatever is going to be the most effective [thing] at any one time. The essence of Situationism--and we are situationists after all ... is perceiving the right place and the right time in which what would otherwise be a useless or ineffective action suddenly becomes very effective because it unleashes a much larger force."

"In the case of *The Jerry Springer Show*," he said, "we were able to manipulate a situation to our advantage. Jerry Springer wasn't expecting to have intelligent guests. He's never had intelligent guests before, and he's never had them since."

Reason Vs. ...

Not having seen the show yet, I asked Korda what reactions he

received after the show. "Outrage and confusion, of course."

Is this what he wants all the time? I related to him something that happened on the Esplanade during the Earthfest protest, when a conversation was had between a normal bystander and one of the COE signholders. There was a relatively rational exchange of opinions without the cursing and lashing out other onlookers demonstrated. (I hadn't mentioned, because he probably already knew, that Mackin was also talking to others, using the COE as a draw, as Mackin said he has in the past.)

"Well, that's fine," said Korda, almost flatly. "I'm not opposed to reason I think that that's not really my area of expertise. I make plenty of rational arguments, of course, all day long; but the [core] of the Church of Euthanasia is that we're not bound by the limits of rationality or the limits of good taste."

"'Eat A Queer Fetus For Jesus' is a profoundly offensive statement to most people, and that's very positive." Korda's positive feeling stems from his view on how the exchanging of information is hindered today. "I think that we live in an age when almost no meaningful communication is taking place because people have been trained to separate everything, every piece of information they encounter, into neat categories, so it can be assimilated and essentially ignored. Most of the time when we're dealing with people, we're not dealing with them at all. We're dealing with their secretaries, their mental secretaries, filing, categorizing, sorting into neat dualisms of right and wrong and good versus evil."

"My object," continued Korda, "is to destroy those categories as much as possible, to present people with information that can't be assimilated and that doesn't fit into their categories. The best possible response to a Church of Euthanasia action is, 'What the fuck are you guys doing? I don't understand. Explain this to me.' That's an ideal reaction, because then we can step in and actually get people to think for themselves, and say 'Well, what do you think it means? What do these words say? Do they have any resonance at all?' And then people are forced to say, 'Well, geez, never really thought about it before.'"

"That's the kind of reaction we're looking for. We're looking for, in a sense, a form of deprogramming."

An Impasse

It was my turn to sail into troubled waters. I asked Korda to go a little into his own life. He steadfastly refused to go into family. "It's not relevant," was his only reply. Only when I awkwardly persisted for more did he shoot me down in more detail and in the process turn the metaphorical camera away from him. "What kind of interview is this really? If this is an interview primarily about me, then I'm less enthusiastic. As you can imagine, I'm a missionary of a sort. I'm a person with a mission. My goal is to communicate ideas which are profoundly subversive and antisocial, to as large a group of people as possible It can only be done by using the tools of Mass Society, okay? The tools of mass society are television, radio, newspapers, all of that."

Then he made the camera do a 180-degree turn. "So you are part of that apparatus, to a certain extent. In a way, my goal is

to persuade you of the righteousness of this cause. To persuade you sufficiently so that you are willing to put yourself on the line, and make some of these ideas available to a larger percentage of the public. To the extent that I succeed in persuading you of the rightness of this cause, I have succeeded in my strategy. If I fail, and I convince you that I am either a crackpot or perhaps some subject for entertainment, or that it would be useful to dig up dirt on my family, then I've failed in my cause. Do you see the problem?"

After a little more banter, we focused less on his past experiences and more on his past attitudes before his vision. He brought me back to 1991, the year, Korda said, he started crossdressing. "In retrospect, I feel that crossdressing was the beginning of an attempt to restore balance within myself, in a psychological sense, specifically between my male and female polar opposites, but also between other aspects of myself."

"But I couldn't see that at the time," admitted Korda, who at that same time made a journey to Provincetown and liked it enough to stay, working as a female impersonator, experiencing house music for the first time, and entering drag-queen competitions. "Second prize was as about the best I ever did," he said. "I couldn't win, because my competition consisted mostly of tough street queens, who had nothing to fall back on except maybe hooking or drugs. That gave their performances an edge that mine just didn't have."

Korda said he returned from Provincetown "still very rough, still a lot of problems, but I built on that," ending his story with the dream about The Being. "In that dream, I first became aware of the larger imbalances around me. That awareness was expressed in the slogan 'Save The Planet Kill Yourself,' and in the lyrics of the song itself."

That song can be found on the recently released *Six Billion Humans Can't Be Wrong*. It's the third album CD Korda has put out to date which shows his interest in house music has not diminished. "I like its soulful quality," said Korda, who, though his background is primarily jazz, finds little difference between techno and other styles. "I think we're surrounded by a lot of really bad electronic music, but we're surrounded by a lot of really bad non-electronic music too."

Compromise

"The Jews suffered terribly, but any sane person will admit that there are still Jews in the world. The same can't be said for the millions of plant and animal species that have become extinct as a result of the human population explosion. Where are the symbols of this species holocaust?" --Chris Korda's response to anti-Semitism charges from German magazine Beam Me Up. From The Church of Euthanasia web site. Later removed.

At the time we talked, Korda hadn't even started to try to get radio play here in America, though he made it clear that he expected the CD to do better outside the country than inside. "Generally, Europeans are much more open-minded about electronic music or about art in general. The United States tends to be, by and large, a very close minded place. Even though it's very dynamic and active in terms of being a source of mass culture, in

my experience, Americans tend to be much more patriotic, xenophobic, racist, homophobic, and generally close-minded than their European counterparts."

Other topics, however, still hit hard in Catholic-influenced Germany. Topics such as religion, abortion, and most notably, The Holocaust. This caused Korda to change the cover of Six Billion Humans, originally a photo of Korda in an oven of the Dachau German death camp of World War Two. "And yet Germany would have been the one perfect place to release it," observed Korda. "Here, in the United States, we'll release it with this photograph, and most people won't get it, because they aren't well-educated enough to know that it's Dachau. They'll think it's a pizza oven."

Korda called the need to create a Germany-approved album cover, "a tragedy," but deemed it necessary in order to have a distributor that can sell a substantial number of copies. "It's all about tactics," Korda confessed, without me challenging him to. "I'm a shrewd business person. I'm not into purity. Purity is for losers. We're out to win this thing."

The Future

"Could humans choose to live in a sustainable way, at a greatly reduced population, by rediscovering ancient wisdom, without abandoning their scientific advances? Possibly, but only if the industrial nations set the example, by drastically reducing both their populations and their consumption. This is why the Church explicitly targets that tiny percentage of humanity who reap the dubious material benefits of domestication: the technological elite, the users of the internet--in short, your readers." --Out take of Mark Dery's e-mail discussion with Chris Korda. From the Church of Euthanasia web site.

Though the parade was the first thing that comes to Korda's mind when he discussed future events, he emphasized promoting the CD as a higher priority, as it can draw attention better than other COE activities. "Mass media culture is very well set up to promote events," he said, "I think that when we have something like [the CD], we can use it as a battering ram, as a way of forcing the press to cover us, even though they would rather not."

He also sees a video documentary the COE's activities as "an easy sell," and very likely in the future. It's possible the film will show various examples of what they are against. In issue #4 of Snuff It, for example, Korda and Eccles discuss a COE trip to Gary Indiana, describing the town as being right out of the movie Eraserhead. Korda would prefer to focus on the unique footage of the Church actions which the majority of people would otherwise never see. "Novelty is definitely a factor in our calculations," said Korda. "Novelty is part of what keeps people clicking on our web site."

He also felt there was enough footage of such places as Gary, Indiana. Too much, in fact, that he felt such images were "in danger of becoming a cliché."

"People are constantly becoming desensitized in some way that we hadn't predicted before," he said, "so we always have to come up with new and different tactics."

Differing Techniques

Supporting the Unabomber for President campaign through the

COE would have violated the its tax-exempt status. Korda therefore acted independently but through the organization UNAPACK, founded by Lydia Eccles, who is also a member of the Church.

At one point, Korda was able to bring up Unabomber Ted Kaczynski as an example of his approach versus that of the COE. "The Unabomber published the whole truth, the real unvarnished truth, at 30,000 words, in the world's most widely read newspapers," said Korda, "and yet almost no one read him. Most of those supplements wound up in the garbage, and the reason why is twofold. First of all, he had zero entertainment value. We're talking about 30,000 words in 10 point type. Most Americans are unlikely to read 30,000 words on any subject, not even sports, never mind the future of industrial society."

"Second of all," continued Korda, "the Unabomber failed to recognize that his audience had already been persuaded--before the Manifesto was even published--not to read it, because he wasn't an expert. He wasn't an officially sanctioned source. In fact the public had been persuaded that he was crank, a serial killer, and that they could safely ignore anything he said."

"These are serious propaganda mistakes that we're not making," declared Korda.

Korda has never talked with Kaczynski, or for that matter Dr. Jack Kevorkian, who Korda said, he would rather "admire from afar," due to the lack of admiration Kevorkian would most likely have for the COE. Korda, however, still predicts that no matter how or when he dies, "he will be the greatest saint of the Church of Euthanasia ... and we will canonize him, but I don't think he needs to know that."

There are figures that do support the work of Korda and the other COE members. Among them, Korda lists Cartoonist Nina Paley, authors Poppy Z. Brite, author and local 'zinester Pagan Kennedy, and 60's icon Paul Krassner. I pointed out the parallels the COE is showing between itself and the church of Scientology: logical arguments mixed with religious visions with celebrity (or pseudo-celebrity) endorsements thrown in. I ask him if it worried him.

"Again, we're not obliged to be consistent," answered Korda, repeating himself a little. "We're not obliged to make sense, and we frequently don't. What we are obliged to do, again and again, is to punch through people's pervasive sense that things can continue the way they are, that business as usual can continue. That's what we're here to do. We're here to interrupt that flow, and whatever tactic works well for that at any given time is what tactic we'll use. If it helps to be rational, we'll be rational. If it helps to be irrational, we'll be irrational."

The Follow Up

Looking over my interview with Chris Korda, there were one or two things that I missed. I called him again, and we met up again. This time at a Bruegger's Bagels,

"It's been a busy day," he assured me as he ordered a quick meal, with me once again electing to only watch. This time, instead of basic black, he sported dressier pants and a button down shirt. The only things that distinguished him from the crowd were his glasses and a few fingernails painted light purple.

Walking to our table with his tray, it seemed he also pondered his clothing selection. "Geez, wear a clean shirt, and everyone's nice to you."

We sat down and he went over what I thought would be three small issues. Two were. The third one, however, gave him pause.

In the course of the first interview, he mentioned that he considered a transsexual operation. I had asked him why he backed down.

"Again, a change of heart. That's another story. We'll get to that in a minute." We never did.

When I asked Korda at Bruegger's to get the story, he took pause. "That's really involved in personal history," he said, wanting once again to make sure my article, "focuses on the ideas, and less on my personal life." I said it would, which was the truth, since I only had his quotes to go on, I had only brought it up because he mentioned it, and I'd accept however he wanted to phrase it.

"With that in mind," he said, "I'll express it this way. I believe, personally, that cross-dressing is the balancing of male and female aspects within a person, within a person's psyche, within their soul, if you will. And everyone has these male and female aspects. I mean, in most cases, they are grossly out of balance due to the extreme gender socialization that we're exposed to as children. Men are forced into extreme male gender roles, women are forced into extreme female gender roles. Just look at the toy store, and you'll see it in action."

"The fact that we survive our childhood conditioning with any of our integrity, and compassion and ability to love intact, is a testimony to the strength of human character. Most humans, of course, are severely damaged, and never recover. That's how the proletarian technological society perpetuates itself."

"So I believe," he continued, "that it wasn't until I became aware of my, what some people have called 'gender dysphoria,' or 'gender uncomfortableness,' that I really began to make any progress in my life, towards a real kind of balance."

"And it wasn't until I began to balance myself, internally," he said, "that I could have any hope of really becoming aware of the larger imbalances that surround me, and do anything about them."

"There's a more technical answer to your question," he added, "and it's not very personal, but I think it's the important answer, the logical answer."

For his logical answer, he brought up his issues with transexuality. "I backed away from it because it's a typically western, patriarchal, interventionist, invasive solution to a problem that could never be solved that way."

"You go to a doctor complaining that you feel trapped in an extreme gender role, and the doctor says, 'Well, if you happen to have \$30,000 ... and a very, very high tolerance for pain, and personal suffering, and two or three years to spend working on this, we will gradually fit you into an equally extreme and ridiculous opposite gender role.'"

"I think it's a shame," said Korda, having taken himself almost completely out of the picture again. "I think it's a

tragedy that so many people succumb to it when what they're really yearning for ... is ambivalence, is balance, to be in a state between the genders, as we all should be, to renounce the extreme and to embrace subtlety and ambiguity."

"To crossdress is to mimic the opposite gender, and that's a positive step." "But the step beyond that is to gender-bend, to occupy the space in between the genders all the time."

He spoke highly of Dennis Rodman. "Whatever else he may believe, which I may or may not agree with, he had the guts to gender-bend while being part of one of the most successful basketball teams in history. He went public and said, 'Yes, I wear a dress, and what are you gonna fuckin' do about it? You don't like that? You got a problem with that? You gonna fuck with me?' Okay? That's pretty amazing."

Korda even considered other gender-bending heroes like Rupaul. "There's a lot of gray areas. Nothing's all good or all bad."

"Remember," finished Korda. "That's one of the essential observations of the church. Nothing is all good or all bad. Even though something may hurt in some ways, it may help in others."

Epilogue

"I guess the thing I most wanted to say is that it doesn't have to be unpleasant or sad, it can be a peaceful, happy leave taking."

Excerpt of the suicide note. From The Church of Euthanasia web site.

I first read the suicide note while Korda was touring Germany. When he came back, he confirmed the validity of it. It was, he said, sent with a \$150 donation in a envelope with no return address, so Korda saw little point in searching for the full identity of M. Millis, whose qualifications for sainthood were still being considered. Korda wished he had more to go on with Millis, more than just an initial and a last name, but he didn't seem overly concerned. "I guess we can probably let that slide."

Most recently, I was able to talk with Supreme at the 10th Annual Freedom Rally held at the Boston Common. He hadn't heard of it yet prior to my telling him there. I asked him on the spot if he thought it was possible that the letter was fake. "It could be that," he mused. "I don't know, if it's real and it's consensual ... that's fine." It took a few minutes before he put it in a humorous context: "Hell, even if the guy didn't kill himself, if he sent a good check, damn it, that deserves sainthood right there! Let me tell you that!"

I also brought up to Supreme his prior comments of adding humor to the COE activities, and asked how it conflicted with Korda's insistence that he and the other members are serious. "Greatly, of course ... but the humor in the Church is undeniable. I think the underpinning critique[s] of industrial society are right on and are heartfelt and pretty damn serious; and the Church's response to that is to create this in-your-face dada spectacle for the people and actually take it to the streets."

"That's why they differ greatly from many, many cults," chuckled Supreme. "There's so many cults to choose from. Which one

are you going to pick?"

Before and after my calling Korda and talking with Supreme, I had of course examined the letter. Millis, whether sincere or not, was very articulate and given to theatrics: "I will enjoy the slow fade, and the long awaited moment. (Bath water deep enough to suffocate me when I pass out)". By not even listing a sex, Millis has achieved a sexual ambiguity Korda can never achieve. Even beyond that, Millis is vague, identifiable only by his deed and the opinion that led to it, identifying him or herself as part of a 'we' collective, though I wouldn't be surprised if the writer was very much alone in his or her thoughts--just as I found it almost inappropriate for Chris to say "we" when he is obviously the COE's leader and its prime mover--if not the only one.

The COE just might have found its perfect and ideal first Saint, perhaps even more appropriate than Kevorkian. However, this brings them and their viewpoints no closer to the spotlight. It's like someone bringing a shrouded item to attention by putting another shroud on top of it.

I'm sure the chat area of the church is guns a-blazing with controversy even now, with this and other topics, maybe wondering if it's all a joke (just as I've wondered on and off while writing this piece whether I'm being put on or not). However, as far as the rest of the world goes, news of the church's potential first saint has fallen on deaf ears, the media shield firmly placed in front.

Q. You remark, in the Spiegel article, that "there are simply too many people on the Earth," which begs the obvious question: How many is too many? In other words, at what point, precisely, did the Earth become **over**populated, as opposed to merely populous, in your opinion? Your statement that there "too many" implies that some human population might be acceptable to you, as opposed to the far fringes of the Deep Ecology movement, where **any** human population is seen as a viral infestation that should be eradicated. Is humanity the problem, as the most misanthropic of the eco-radicals would argue, or is the conspicuously consuming, solid-waste producing lifestyle of the highly industrialized nations the culprit? If the latter, why don't you specifically target the so-called First World in your "Save the Planet---Kill Yourself" message? As well, why not call, like the Unabomber, for a return to a pre-industrial lifestyle, rather than the eradication of humanity itself, which is what your message seems to imply? Alternatively, if in fact you **are** calling for the extermination of Homo sapiens in the name of salvation of the planet, why frame the problem in terms of **excess** population---"too many people on the Earth"---rather than population, period?

A. Unlike some of its sister organizations--the Voluntary Human Extinction Movement, for example, or the germ-warfare advocates at the Gaia Liberation Front--the Church of Euthanasia is not advocating human extinction, except possibly as a last resort. The Church is devoted to restoring balance between humans and the remaining species, through voluntary population reduction. Modern humans are out of balance, not only with the world, and with each other, but within themselves, in the sense of mass neurosis that Wilhelm Reich described. The restoration of balance will require a leap of consciousness within each individual; the day-to-day operations of the Church are a heartfelt--albeit Quixotic--attempt to provoke that leap, using the propaganda tools of industrial society.

Paleontology tells us that humans have existed in a recognizable form for at least two, and possibly as much as four million years. By contrast, the world-view that now dominates 99% of humanity was almost unknown 5000 years ago. The rapid expansion of the modern world-view follows not only writing and symbolic culture, but more importantly the transition from nomadic hunting and gathering to sedentary agriculture and its obsession with surplus.

Daniel Quinn has aptly contrasted the tribal and modern views as those of "leavers" and "takers," implying that tribal humans, whatever their shortcomings, did not imagine that they were the sole purpose of creation and that earth should only grow food for them. Tribal world-views typically include a profound reverence for wilderness, a belief in the rightness of the natural world, and a marked preference for "being"--oral tradition, lore, ritual, shared experience--over "gaining" of material things.

Unlimited population growth is the inevitable consequence of a society based on "gaining", without regard for future generations,

even of humans. The question is not when the earth became overpopulated, but when humans became unbalanced, and began to live in an unsustainable way. Most people agree that "taker" culture evolved--or devolved--out of "leaver" culture, but the change is almost always presented as a dualism, either as "progress" or "disintegration", depending on your point of view. Only two directions are considered, forward--towards progress--and backward, the "return to pre-industrial life" you mention. Could humans choose to live in a sustainable way, at a greatly reduced population, by rediscovering ancient wisdom, without abandoning their scientific advances? Possibly, but only if the industrial nations set the example, by drastically reducing both their populations and their consumption. This is why the Church explicitly targets that tiny percentage of humanity who reap the dubious material benefits of domestication: the technological elite, the users of the internet--in short, your readers.

Q. You were affiliated with the Unabomber For President group, UNAPACK, and have said that you're "very sympathetic" to his beliefs. Help me out: I'm having difficulty reconciling your Unabomber fandom with your stated opposition to "all involuntary population reduction." Thinning the herd through serial mail-bombing strikes me as "involuntary," at least for the luckless wretches who opened Ted Kaczynski's packages. Moreover, color me hopelessly humanist, but I fail to see the political virtue in blowing away someone like Hugh Scrutton, whose apparent crime against humanity was renting computers, or Gilbert P. Murray, an official of the California Forestry Association who wasn't even the Unabomber's intended victim. Don't you have some pause about a man whose campaign of terror seems one part ideology, nine parts sociopathology? Most of the Unabomber's victims were *not*, as you've asserted, "directly connected to either genetics or computer science." In addition to *one* geneticist and *one* computer-science professor, they included an advertising executive, a timber-industry lobbyist, an engineering professor, an airline president, a psychology professor's assistant, a university secretary, a school guard, and two computer store owners---hardly the power elite of the Industrial Society he railed against. How deep can the Deep Ecology run in a man who wrote in his diary that he had "no regret" that the wrong man---married and a father of two---was his accidental victim?

A. All worthy targets, when the goal is correctly understood. The Unabomber was not attempting to assassinate the "power elite" of industrial society, nor could he, since they are obviously too numerous and replaceable. The Unabomber was fighting a guerilla war against the media system, represented not only by the corporate fortresses of the New York Times and the Washington Post, but also by thousands of lesser protectors of the status quo, such as yourself. His strategy was to blackmail the media into publishing what would otherwise be unpublishable: a 30,000 word indictment of every aspect of the technological state, including specific advice on how best to destroy it, in what may prove to be its only moment of weakness. He chose his victims

carefully for their symbolic value, leaving the media with little choice but to publish his manifesto, footnotes and all. It can be argued that the strategy was nonetheless a failure: the public largely ignored the manifesto, having already been cleverly persuaded that its author wasn't a sanctioned expert--despite his academic credentials--and could therefore be safely ignored. From this point of view even the relatively incoherent efforts of the Church of Euthanasia are more effective, because they are disguised as entertainment and therefore sell themselves easily without the need for blackmail.

Personally, I have neither the skill nor the disposition to be a successful guerilla, and in any case I'm already too well-known. I encourage voluntary population reduction in my official capacity, but as a private citizen, I applaud the courage and tenacity of those who do battle with the technological state, and occasionally win small victories, against impossible odds. Our global, industrial prison-state has six billion inmates, consumes unimaginable quantities of minerals, plants, and animals, and vomits a toxic soup of death into every remote cavity of this once-flourishing planet. American criticism of the Unabomber's violence seems especially surreal at this moment, as our B-52s reduce the urban population of former Yugoslavia to stone-age conditions. To think that such monstrous abuse of power can be corrected by nursing pacifist sentiments in the wilderness--or what's left of it--is simply naive.

Q. The CoE's rhetoric sometimes fudges the distinction between population reduction and pedophobia. Flamboyant baby-loathing, from Evelyn Waugh's revulsion at his own offspring to Debbie Goad's bilious Answer Me! screed, "Babies Are Dirty" ("Babies are dirty. Babies are disgusting...When I see a newborn, I feel nauseous."), is a tried-and-true vanguardist tactic for outraging the bourgeoisie. Given some of the CoE's fellow travelers---the career bad boy and Answer Me! publisher Jim Goad, the serial killer-worshipper Randall Phillips, both of whom make fleeting appearance in Snuff It---it's tempting to see the CoE as part of the venerable tradition of certifying one's credentials as a subcultural badass by scandalizing the squares.

A. No, Mark, I think you are the one most concerned about "certifying your credentials as a subcultural badass." I have no patience with smug academics who masquerade as cultural revolutionaries, or self-styled "culture jammers" who drape their feeble leftist sentiments in art-world jargon, the better to be pimped in trendy galleries. While there are undeniably too many of them, babies are natural enough. Pompous critics are truly dirty, and boring.

Q. Marvelous. I've only skimmed your last two responses, but they're every bit as spirited as I'd hoped---especially that blast of buckshot directed at "smug academics who masquerade as cultural revolutionaries, or self-styled "culture jammers" who drape their feeble leftist sentiments in art-world jargon, the better to be

pimped in trendy galleries." Well worth the price of admission! (But I'm confused as to which I am, since I'm not an "academic"---I hold no degree loftier than a B.A., and have never taught---nor have I ever styled myself a "culture jammer." For the record, the trendiness of CB's gallery is right up there with short-sleeved suits and Whitesnake albums; I've pimped my feeble, jargon-encrusted leftist sentiments in far hipper cultural brothels, I must protest.)

Now, my last question; I look forward to a showstopping response, at least the equal of your answers so far.

As I understand it, the CoE's holiest commandment, "save the planet, kill yourself," is founded on the neo-Malthusian article of faith that the Earth's population is exploding exponentially, thereby straining the planet's presumably already groaning carrying capacity to the breaking point. The next millennium, the story goes, will witness environmental apocalypse and social breakdown---"suffering on a scale we can't even imagine yet," as you put it, _Population Bomb_ nightmares that will make some wish they "had killed yourselves, because this planet is going to be a very grim and frightening place." The Church concedes the disproportionate environmental impact of highly industrialized societies---the exploitation of nature as an infinitely renewable raw material for capitalism's vicious cycle production and consumption. Nonetheless, the Church focuses almost exclusively on what it sees as the dire, almost apocalyptic need for population reduction, championing abortion as a social good and contraception as a global obligation. In so doing, it lays the full burden of social responsibility at the individual's doorstep.

There are some loose links in the chain of reasoning, here. First, straight-line projections of a global population increasing by orders of magnitude in the next century are far from inarguable. Ben Wattenberg contends, in his _New York Times Magazine_ essay "The Population Explosion Is Over," that the much-feared population bomb is ending in an anticlimactic fizzle.

"Never before have birthrates fallen so far, so fast, so low, for so long all around the world," he writes, citing "World Population Prospects: The 1996 Revision," a study published by the United Nations Population Division. But even if we accept, for argument's sake, the Church's keystone assumption that the global population is going to mushroom to eight billion by 2010, the environmental apocalypse the CoE is trying to avert has less to do with overpopulation than overconsumption. A low-population, high-consumption country like Canada has the same population *in consumption-adjusted terms* as India, although its actual population is only four percent of India's. Likewise, the consumption-adjusted population of the United States is more than *twice* that of China. So why isn't the CoE emphasizing the Godzilla footprint left by consumer culture and industrialization *over* individual responsibility for population growth? Why isn't it training its crosshairs on the real menace of multinational capitalism instead of paper tigers like the Catholic church, whose

medieval prohibitions on contraception and masturbation are blithely ignored by many Catholics. (It may comfort---and discomfit---you to know that Italy, where Catholicism is the state religion, has the world's lowest fertility rate (1.2 children per woman) and "the lowest national rate ever recorded (absent famines, plagues, wars or economic catastrophes)," according to Wattenberg.) As well, the visions of global famine, food riots, and gothic horrors straight out of Soylent Green invoked by Malthusian doomsayers from Paul Ehrlich to the CoE all proceed from the good Reverend's premise that while population "increases in a geometrical ratio," that scarcest of vital resources, food, "increases only in an arithmetical ratio." Natural law, in the Malthusian gospel the CoE preaches, is the implacable administrator of scarce resources. To Malthus and his latter-day disciples, human institutions exert little influence "in comparison with those deeper-seated causes of evil, which result from the laws of nature, and the passions of mankind." But Malthus lived in a world where natural law also enthroned the white European male on top of the Great Chain of Being. The ruling powers have used Nature as a ventriloquist's dummy too many times, making it mouth societal "truths" that serve the status quo, for us not to be suspicious of claims made on its behalf. In this light, the "natural" scarcity conjured up by the CoE turns out to be as manmade as the specters in a theme-park spookhouse. Scarcity, as Andrew Ross points out in The Chicago Gangster Theory of Life: Nature's Debt to Society, is "a political tool, skillfully manipulated by the powerful whenever it suits their purpose: The structural poverty and hunger that has accompanied postcolonial underdevelopment and monocultural farming is not the result of natural scarcity, not at a time when the world's food production is still above the levels for supporting its population." Again, the root cause is not "natural" limits, but the artificial scarcity created by agribusiness giants in the name of profit maximization or, in some cases, by inept or corrupt governments who neglect or prevent the distribution of food. The United Nations Population Fund's 1998 report on the state of the world's population flatly states that "there is no overall global shortage of food, and that with equitable distribution there should be sufficient to meet all needs for the foreseeable future." The weasel word, of course, is "equitable," and equity is in short supply in the New World Order of global capitalism, where the economic chasm between rich and poor countries is widening.

In conclusion, the CoE's emphasis on individual choice, rather than corporate power and capitalist ideology, strikes me as a strategic error that leaves it tilting at windmills. Moreover, the misanthropy that lies just beneath the surface of the CoE's baby-loathing and breeder-bashing aligns it with the unhappiest of bedfellows---naked apologists for the power elite like Ehrlich, whose Population Bomb reels with Hieronymous Boschian visions of the overbreeding underclasses, like the swarming, locustlike masses glimpsed during a taxi ride through Delhi: "My wife and daughter and I were returning to our hotel in an ancient taxi.

The seats were hopping with fleas.... The streets seemed alive with people. People eating, people washing, people sleeping. People visiting, arguing, and screaming. People thrusting their hands through the taxi window, begging. People defecating and urinating. People clinging to buses. People herding animals. People, people, people, people." Here, then, is Dorian Gray's true face, the racism, classism, and misanthropy that are too often hidden behind the dream of a pre-industrial, nay, pre-human Paradise Regained, a wilderness world emptied at last of the eating, washing, sleeping, visiting, arguing, screaming, begging, defecating, urinating masses. And the masses, naturally, are always the teeming, undifferentiated others---everyone, that is, but me.

A. I can certainly be described as misanthrope--or more correctly as an anti-humanist--but that doesn't make me racist or classist. In fact I oppose both on the same grounds that I oppose nationalism and humanism. Racists imagine they are superior to other races, classists imagine they are superior to other classes, nationalists imagine they are superior to other nations, and humanists imagine they are superior to other species. Globalists imagine industrial society is superior to all other cultures, hence the need to export it to every corner of the globe. The common thread through all of these, obviously, is superiority. Personally, I remain unconvinced of my superiority, despite years of expensive conditioning. I tend to view humans the way a being from outer space would view them: as a species, housed among many other species.

Overall, as a species, since, say, 500 B.C. or so, humans have been behaving oddly. They started by cutting down all the trees in their places of origin, often in order to make boats to spread themselves everywhere else. They have been amazingly effective at turning wilderness into human biomass, but until recently appeared oblivious to the long-term consequences of this strategy. Now that the consequences are abundant--in the form of climate change, topsoil loss, and toxicity--changes are being made, but for the most part they are half-hearted reforms, far short of the about-face that is so urgently needed. The tool-wielding apes--again, viewed as a species--are either sucking as hard as they can on the tit of industrial society, living in flamboyant denial of the limits of their environment, or seeking to do so as soon as possible, usually by going to war with their neighbors.

Thus the most prominent characteristic of the human species appears to be a lethal combination of arrogance and stupidity. The underlying problem is that humans think they are superior to everything else, when in fact--from the point of view of long-term survival--they are the least well-adapted social creatures on the planet, unlike the ants, who are much more likely to inherit the earth, as Paul Erlich has observed.

As you correctly point out, the Church of Euthanasia focuses primarily on population rather than consumption. It is also true

that our message is only received by the elite of the industrial nations, who are leading the charge, in terms of consumption. So the question is, since most of the industrial nations are approaching population stability anyway, why do we focus on population?

Suppose you're a "good consumer." Let's say you recycle, buy "green" products, donate to environmental causes, and so on. You even limit yourself to one child, and you're determined to raise the child with values similar to yours, ensuring that he or she will carry on the good work of saving the earth for future generations. Now let's just say, for arguments' sake, that your child rebels against your middle-class, intellectual, politically correct conditioning, and winds up swilling beer in a trailer park, with three kids. It happens. And what guarantee do we have that those three kids are going follow in the noble footsteps of their grandparent? None whatsoever. Let's say one rises above his humble roots and becomes an investment banker, with a Porche, a house in the suburbs, and two fashionably dressed children. Another elopes with a biker, sets up shop in a nearby trailer park, and produces some less well-groomed specimens. The third becomes a priest and only has sex with boys--a partial success anyway.

Guess what? You just wiped out all the gain from your recycling, "green" consuming, and tax-deductible contributions. Not only did you wipe it out, you reversed it, many times over. How did it happen? It happened because individual consumption affects the future **linearly**, while procreation affects it **exponentially**. The impact of a single child on future generations can't even be approximated, because there are too many variables. It should be obvious by now why the Church is advocating massive voluntary population reduction in the industrial nations. We're advocating it because it's the only way the current generation can affect the distant future. It's just too late--way too late--for cutting back on consumption and hoping for the best. We can no longer afford to gamble on something as tenuous as the transmission of values from parents to children. We need to reduce the number of Americans, Europeans, and Japanese, as soon as possible, by at least a factor of ten, no matter what.

I also believe it's unreasonable to demand that people abandon all of their social conditioning at once. It's not just a question of giving up convenience. The people I'm reaching have, by and large, learned only the skills that are useful to industrial society--mathematics, logic, reading, writing, analysis, and so forth--and have absorbed the esthetics of industrial society--such as they are--in the process. I'm no exception to this. I identify strongly with technical culture, because it's all I know. If I were suddenly transported to the wilderness, even given friendly tribal neighbors willing to tolerate my ineptness, I would almost certainly go crazy. No amount of wishing would make me a tribal person, raised by oral tradition to love wilderness and survive in it easily. Deprived of usefulness, my experience

would be similar to that of elderly people confined in nursing homes.

By comparison, not having children is hardly even a sacrifice, for me, or for most members of the technical elite. The decline of birth rates in the industrial countries only proves this point. Most people I know are much too busy answering e-mail and updating their web pages to raise children, even if they were willing to give up so much of their disposable income. The very rich continue to breed, in part because children have become status symbols, but more importantly because they can afford to pay others to raise their children for them. Leisure time is the holy grail of technological society, and is unlikely to be increased by procreation. It's possible that the elite will prove self-eliminating, in a kind of reverse Darwinism: population reduction via hedonism and sheer selfishness. From this point of view, the Church of Euthanasia is simply encouraging an existing trend, a reasonable strategy in any situation.

Q. As a "protector of the status quo" and gutless stooge for the manufacturers of consent, I usually fabricate my so-called "facts" outright, of course. But I'm feeling _GiGi_ tonight, and have decided, just this once, to report empirically verifiable facts. Please assist me in my campaign for fairness and accuracy in mass mind-control by nailing down the following details:

1> What's your relationship to UNAPACK? Did you found it?

Unapack was founded and run by Lydia Eccles. I was merely a loyal campaign worker. I wrote some of the campaign literature, dealt with the media on numerous occasions, and accompanied Lydia to the New Hampshire primary and the Democratic Convention in 1996. I was also the Unapack poster girl.

2> Are you "Chris" or "Chrissy?"

Both.

3> Randall Phillips is listed as a "contact" in _Snuff It_ #4. Why? What's the connection between him, or his thought and writings, and the CoE?

Randall's descriptions of humanity as a "Martian invasion" have much in common with my view from outer space described above. Humans are behaving like bacteria in a petri dish, and if nothing is done their fate will be similar. The main difference is that while he identifies "intelligent", aryan, male humans as superior, and presents himself as an example thereof, I don't share his optimism, and regard him--and myself--as part of the problem.

4> So are the Goads. Again, what's the connection?

The Goads have a flair for expressing the pervasive ugliness of modern life, and for linking the ugliness to neurosis and sexual

abuse, in the most shocking and personal way. Again, we agree about the problems, but not about the solutions.

Okay we got your fax, I'm just reading it now...what is this position?

I'm sorry?

What is this position?

We have a variety of non-paid positions, all different kinds of things, helping out in the office, typing, warehouse, there's a lot of different stuff people can do, it kind of depends on what abilities they have, and what they want to do.

What's this "young, good chin"?

Sorry?

What does "young, good chin mean"?

Well, we'd prefer someone young, and someone with, you know...how do you say...a good attitude, someone's who's together.

"No breeders"?

No breeders. I guess you're not familiar with our organization. We're one the world's leading advocates of population reduction. As I said in the fax, we were described at some length in the Phoenix a couple of weeks ago.

Okay, well you can place this ad, it'll be \$12 per line...

Okay.

And it's going to be four lines, so it's ah, 48\$ per week.

Okay, can I start by running it for a week, to see what kind of response we get...

You can run it for as long you like.

[credit card info exchanged]

Now, did you call earlier and try to get this into the variations section of the paper?

It's possible that someone else in the office did. I'll have to talk to them, there was some confusion, I remember...I'll have talk to Pastor Scott about that, there was some confusion about how it was supposed to be run.

How do you want it run?

We're advertising for an intern... for a volunteer. We have volunteers already.

Okay, but was the initial intent to put this in the adult section?

It certainly wasn't my intent...I'm not sure what you mean.

Well I don't know either, but someone called and was asking about the adult service section, and then read an ad that was similar to, if not this ad, I don't know because I didn't speak to the person...but ah, now that I'm reading this, not knowing this information, are you trying to, what's this "intern for desk-bound fun," you're not...is there an underlying meaning to this ad is what I'm asking.

No, I don't think so.

Well, various non-paid positions...move up and down the corporate ladder...young, good chin... I mean, because, I'm not going to run this ad if you want it in the adult services section. If it's an adult intended ad, fine, I'll run it in the adult service section, but I am not going to run it under volunteers...if this is an ad seeking sex.

It's not an ad seeking sex.

Now how come the person that called before, Rev. Scott you say his name is?

Pastor Scott.

Pastor Scott, was, ah, asking about the adult service section? Is this for an adult related activity, because if it is I can put it in the adult service section, I have no problem with that. But if this is some type of a joke, then...

The Church of Euthanasia is not a joke.

I'm not saying the Church of Euthanasia is a joke, I'm saying if this ad is intended for sexual content, and you're trying to put it in under volunteer positions...I'm not calling...I'm not saying that your church is a joke, I'm saying that if that what the intent of this ad is, then I'm not amused by it.

No, no, it's not a joke, everything in that ad is factual.

So...

Listen, this is a non-paid position that we have, I mean we don't want it to appear too onerous. Obviously we're going to try to help people to enjoy the time they put in here, and have it be fun for them, you know, it's not going to be...slaving away in the office all the time. There's going to be social activities, we're going to try to get people involved in the activities of the church. So essentially what I'm saying is, this is not Chase Manhattan Bank we're running, okay?

Okay...

We are a foundation, and we have our own ways of running things.

Okay, because, you know, exactly what I said before, okay?

Sure. I understand what you're saying.

Good. Alright, thank you.

Okay, is that it? Is there some possibility that I could get an invoice?

It'll appear on your credit card. If you'd like an invoice, do you have a fax number, we could fax it you...

Italian parliament is now engaged with important laws about entry of transgenic food in our country. The Italian industrial enterprises are convinced that we can't be behind the times and that the future of agriculturist economy is biotechnologies. What's your opinion about it?

Which are the possibilities for European economy to resist to American industry's advance? How can Europe contrast with such strong political interests?

The arguments in support of biotechnologies are the following: 1. Technologies of genetically engineered organism follow the same logic used in traditional agriculture, but they are more sophisticated. Therefore, Ogm cannot cause any damage to our biosphere and to our health. 2. Different variety of vegetables realized in laboratory are the modern way to preserve biodiversity. Therefore, worries about negative changes in environment are unjustified. 3. With genetic science poor countries like Africa and Asia could resolve their problems (famine, poor supply...) 4. Science and progress cannot be arrested. What do you answer to these arguments?

Thank you very much for your attention. Many greetings also from my colleague M. Zatterin. Francesca Sforza

Any discussion of economics or biotechnology must be grounded in the understanding that we live in a greatly depleted world. Modern man has simplified the earth's ecosystems, primarily by directly replacing biological diversity with monoculture crops. The resulting food surpluses have fueled a population explosion, which has in turn demanded even more food production. Over several thousand years, modern man has destroyed vast areas of wilderness, while releasing a toxic soup of chemicals and radiation into the land, water, and air. This has caused extinction of species on an astonishing scale, due not only to habitat destruction, but also habitat fragmentation, overkill, invasive species, and secondary effects cascading through ecosystems from other extinctions. Though estimates vary, it is clear that there are far less species today, than there were before the onslaught of civilization. Some estimates place the loss as high as one-third of the species on earth. Recent studies indicate that species are vanishing at a much greater rate than previously thought, particularly in the tropical rainforests, where it's estimated that a species is lost to extinction every fifteen minutes. The natural or "background" rate of extinction is by comparison a few species every million years. There have been five mass extinctions in history, the most recent being the Cretaceous, and the consensus among paleontologists is that we're well on our way into a sixth one. The difference is that this time, the cause is human activity, rather than an asteroid.

One consequence of the depletion and simplification of earth's ecosystems is the rapid acceleration of entropy: the conversion of both energy and matter from available to unavailable forms. While

dissipation and equilibrium are inevitable on the universal scale, within a given space and time, entropy can be slowed, halted, and even reversed. The history of evolution on earth provides an miraculous example of sustainable negative entropy, gradually transforming a barren, volcanic rock into a rich, highly ordered, interdependent web of life. Modern man imitates this natural process, and creates complexity and surplus in the short term, but only at the price of creating fatal disorder in the long term. As the cities and suburbs expand, the fields of monoculture also expand, and the topsoil washes into the ocean. It is no coincidence that many of the birthplaces of civilization are now deserts. The illusion of prosperity is sustained by borrowing from the well-being of future generations, who will inherit a chaotic, parched world, with an atmosphere far less suitable for life. As their niches are destroyed, highly specialized species vanish, to be replaced by weedy species that can easily adapt to hostile human environments. Like scar tissue, the weedy species are a warning that earth is sick, and needs time to heal: her disordered ecosystems are fragile, and unlikely to recover from further assaults. A planet of weeds, on which only rats, roaches, pigeons, and humans thrive, is the next step towards a desert planet.

In short, depleting earth's diversity weakens the chances for the long-term survival of life here. Aside from this logical argument, there are also potent ethical arguments against further depletion. Who ever said that the earth should only grow food for humans? By what right do we destroy what may be our only living companions in the universe? Humanists argue that man is the measure of all things, and that his reasoning abilities make him superior to all other life. Where is the proof of this superiority? In the poisoned rivers? In the barren earth, baked by ultraviolet radiation no longer blocked by a damaged atmosphere? We reject the notion that humans are the purpose of life, and agree instead with author Frank Herbert, who wrote that the aim of life is simple:

"to maintain and produce coordinated patterns of greater and greater diversity. Life improves the closed system's capacity to sustain life. Life--all life--is in the service of life."

Humans are clearly not in service of life. It's not even clear that they are in service of themselves, from any point of view other than acquisition of material wealth. So with this in mind, we can say that biotech firms are indeed following the same logic used in modern industrial agriculture, the logic of increasing short-term profit at the price of destroying the future. This logic has reversed millions of years of evolution, and caused nothing but damage to the biosphere. Human health outside the rich nations has been damaged all along, and even among the elite of the US and Europe, health now begins to suffer. The elite responds, typically, by creating new markets for less toxic water and food. How long will this last, while all around the exclusive organic farms and artisan wells, pesticides are being poured in

every-increasing quantities onto crops specially engineered for this purpose, by Monsanto and its allies?

It can be argued that humans are replacing earth's natural diversity with an equal diversity of engineered products, but these products are at best only useful to humans, and what's more, unlike the earth's natural diversity, which stood the test of millions of years, the new products are hardly tested at all. Instead they are introduced one after another, as quickly as profit can be made, with no attempt to even calculate the side effects. As with the automobile industry, the real costs are hidden because they are too enormous to consider: topsoil loss, genetic pollution, weakened ecosystems, and acceleration of entropy.

Modern industrial food production has greatly expanded earth's carrying capacity for one species--homo sapiens. In order to accomplish this, most wilderness has been converted to growing human food, and in the process has been poisoned, simplified, and depleted. This has allowed a huge surge in our population, while exterminating vast numbers of non-humans. What arguments were used to justify destroying the small farmers, and replacing them with transnational agribusiness companies like ADM? We must use technology to feed the starving millions. Decades later, there are six billion of us, instead of two billion, and the starving millions are still starving, more than ever before. Now the biotech companies want us to believe that if we extend the earth's carrying capacity even further, the starving millions will somehow magically be fed? Nonsense. Much more likely is that the earth's basic systems--climate, hydrological, atmosphere, topsoil--will continue to break down at an accelerating rate, while the poor nations fight the richer ones for their share of a dwindling pie.

And all for what? So that Americans and Europeans can have every convenience, and sit, immobilized, alone and isolated, in front of computers? So that cities can be connected by vast ribbons of asphalt, on which cars are frozen in bumper-to-bumper traffic? Industrial society has been a disaster for the human race too, not only for other species example. Modern history is the history of monumental stupidity and arrogance, of which the desire to turn ourselves and every other living thing into manufactured products is only the latest example.

Any discussion of economics or biotechnology must be grounded in the understanding that we live in a greatly depleted world. Modern man has simplified the earth's ecosystems, primarily by directly replacing biological diversity with monoculture crops. The resulting food surpluses have fueled a population explosion, which has in turn demanded even more food production. Over several thousand years, modern man has destroyed vast areas of wilderness, while releasing a toxic soup of chemicals and radiation into the land, water, and air. This has caused extinction of species on an astonishing scale, due not only to habitat destruction, but also habitat fragmentation, overkill, invasive species, and secondary effects cascading through ecosystems from other extinctions. Though estimates vary, it is clear that there are far less species today, than there were before the onslaught of civilization. Some estimates place the loss as high as one-third of the species on earth. Recent studies indicate that species are vanishing at a much greater rate than previously thought, particularly in the tropical rainforests, where it's estimated that a species is lost to extinction every fifteen minutes. The natural rate of species die-off--usually known as the "background rate"--is by comparison a few species every million years. There have been five mass extinctions in history, the most recent being the Cretaceous extinction, and the consensus among paleontologists is that we're now well on our way into a sixth one. The difference is that this time, the cause is human activity, rather than an asteroid.

The most important consequence of the depletion and simplification of earth's ecosystems is the rapid acceleration of entropy: the conversion of both energy and matter from available to unavailable forms. While dissipation and equilibrium are inevitable on the universal scale, within a given space and time, entropy can be slowed, halted, and even reversed. The history of evolution on earth provides an miraculous example of sustainable negative entropy, gradually transforming a barren, volcanic rock into a rich, highly ordered, interdependent web of life. Modern man imitates this natural process, and creates complex systems in the short term, but only at the price of creating far greater disorder in the long term. As the cities and suburbs expand, the fields of monoculture also expand, and the topsoil washes into the ocean. It is no coincidence that many of the birthplaces of civilization are now deserts. A depleted, disordered earth is a fragile earth, an earth that will not recover easily from further assaults. A planet of weeds, on which only rats, roaches, pigeons, and humans thrive, is the next step towards a desert planet. The apparent prosperity of the modern nations is an illusion sustained by borrowing from the well-being of future generations, who will inherit a parched world, with an atmosphere no longer suitable even for humans. How will these future humans repay the enormous debt? What gives us the right to inflict it on them? Who are we to decide the fate of the remaining non-humans, who may be our only living companions in the universe? Where is written that the earth should only grow food for us? Should we unravel billions of years of evolution in a few thousand years, just because we can?

Any discussion of economics or biotechnology must be grounded in the understanding that we live in a greatly depleted world. Modern man has simplified the earth's ecosystems, primarily by directly replacing biological diversity with monoculture crops. The resulting food surpluses have fueled a population explosion, which has in turn demanded even more food production. Over several thousand years, modern man has destroyed vast areas of wilderness, while releasing a toxic soup of chemicals and radiation into the land, water, and air. This has caused extinction of species on an astonishing scale, due not only to habitat destruction, but also habitat fragmentation, overkill, invasive species, and secondary effects cascading through ecosystems from other extinctions. Though estimates vary, it is clear that there are far less species today, than there were before the onslaught of civilization. Some estimates place the loss as high as one-third of the species on earth. Recent studies indicate that species are vanishing at a much greater rate than previously thought, particularly in the tropical rainforests, where it's estimated that a species is lost to extinction every fifteen minutes. The natural or "background" rate of extinction is by comparison a few species every million years. There have been five mass extinctions in history, the most recent being the Cretaceous, and the consensus among paleontologists is that we're well on our way into a sixth one. The difference is that this time, the cause is human activity, rather than an asteroid.

One consequence of the depletion and simplification of earth's ecosystems is the rapid acceleration of entropy: the conversion of both energy and matter from available to unavailable forms. While dissipation and equilibrium are inevitable on the universal scale, within a given space and time, entropy can be slowed, halted, and even reversed. The history of evolution on earth provides an miraculous example of sustainable negative entropy, gradually transforming a barren, volcanic rock into a rich, highly ordered, interdependent web of life. Modern man imitates this natural process, and creates complexity and surplus in the short term, but only at the price of creating fatal disorder in the long term. As the cities and suburbs expand, the fields of monoculture also expand, and the topsoil washes into the ocean. It is no coincidence that many of the birthplaces of civilization are now deserts. The illusion of prosperity is sustained by borrowing from the well-being of future generations, who will inherit a chaotic, parched world, with an atmosphere far less suitable for life. As their niches are destroyed, highly specialized species vanish, to be replaced by weedy species that can easily adapt to hostile human environments. Like scar tissue, the weedy species are a warning that earth is sick, and needs time to heal: her disordered ecosystems are fragile, and unlikely to recover from further assaults. A planet of weeds, on which only rats, roaches, pigeons, and humans thrive, is the next step towards a desert planet.

In short, depleting earth's diversity weakens the chances for the long-term survival of life here. Aside from this logical

argument, there are also potent ethical arguments against further depletion. Who ever said that the earth should only grow food for humans? By what right do we destroy what may be our only living companions in the universe? Humanists argue that man is the measure of all things, and that his reasoning abilities make him superior to all other life. Where is the proof of this superiority? In the poisoned rivers? In the barren earth, baked by ultraviolet radiation no longer blocked by a damaged atmosphere? We reject the notion that humans are the purpose of life, and agree instead with author Frank Herbert, who wrote that the aim of life is simple:

"to maintain and produce coordinated patterns of greater and greater diversity. Life improves the closed system's capacity to sustain life. Life--all life--is in the service of life."

Humans are clearly not in service of life. It's not even clear that they are in service of themselves, from any point of view other than acquisition of material wealth. So with this in mind, we can say that biotech firms are indeed following the same logic used in modern industrial agriculture, the logic of increasing short-term profit at the price of destroying the future. This logic has reversed millions of years of evolution, and caused nothing but damage to the biosphere. Human health outside the rich nations has been damaged all along, and even among the elite of the US and Europe, health now begins to suffer. The elite responds, typically, by creating new markets for less toxic water and food. How long will this last, while all around the exclusive organic farms and artisan wells, pesticides are being poured in every-increasing quantities onto crops specially engineered for this purpose, by Monsanto and its allies?

It can be argued that humans are replacing earth's natural diversity with an equal diversity of engineered products, but these products are at best only useful to humans, and what's more, unlike the earth's natural diversity, which stood the test of millions of years, the new products are hardly tested at all. Instead they are introduced one after another, as quickly as profit can be made, with no attempt to even calculate the side effects. As with the automobile industry, the real costs are hidden because they are too enormous to consider: topsoil loss, genetic pollution, weakened ecosystems, and acceleration of entropy.

Modern industrial food production has greatly expanded earth's carrying capacity for one species--homo sapiens. In order to accomplish this, most wilderness has been converted to growing human food, and in the process has been poisoned, simplified, and depleted. This has allowed a huge surge in our population, while exterminating vast numbers of non-humans. What arguments were used to justify destroying the small farmers, and replacing them with transnational agribusiness companies like ADM? We must use technology to feed the starving millions. Decades later, there are six billion of us, instead of two billion, and the starving

millions are still starving, more than ever before. Now the biotech companies want us to believe that if we extend the earth's carrying capacity even further, the starving millions will somehow magically be fed? Nonsense. Much more likely is that the earth's basic systems--climate, hydrological, atmosphere, topsoil--will continue to break down at an accelerating rate, while the poor nations fight the richer ones for their share of a dwindling pie.

And all for what? So that Americans and Europeans can have every convenience, and sit, immobilized, alone and isolated, in front of computers? So that cities can be connected by vast ribbons of asphalt, on which cars are frozen in bumper-to-bumper traffic? Industrial society has been a disaster for the human race too, not only for other species. Modern history is replete with monumental stupidity and arrogance. The desire to turn ourselves and every other living thing into engineered products is only the latest example.

Any discussion of economics or biotechnology must be grounded in the understanding that we live in a depleted world. Modern industrial food production has greatly expanded earth's carrying capacity for one species--homo sapiens. In order to accomplish this, most of earth's biological diversity has been plowed under, and replaced with monocultures of a small number of human food crops. This has caused extinction of species on an astonishing scale: some estimates place the loss as high as one-third of the species on earth. Species are disappearing at a much greater rate than previously thought, particularly in the tropical rainforests, where it's estimated that a species is lost to extinction every fifteen minutes. The natural or "background" rate of extinction is by comparison a few species every million years. There have been five mass extinctions in history, and the consensus among paleontologists is that we're well on our way into a sixth one. The difference is that this time, the cause is human activity, rather than an asteroid.

Depleting earth's diversity weakens the chances for the long-term survival of life. As the cities and suburbs expand, and the fields of monoculture expand with them, the precious topsoil washes into the ocean. It's no coincidence that many of the birthplaces of civilization are now deserts. The illusion of modern prosperity is sustained by borrowing from the well-being of future generations, who will inherit a chaotic, parched world, with an atmosphere far less suitable for life. As their niches become farmland--or wasteland--highly specialized species vanish, to be replaced by weedy species that can easily adapt to hostile human environments. Like scar tissue, the weedy species are a warning that earth is sick, and needs time to heal: her disordered ecosystems are fragile, and unlikely to recover from further assaults. A planet of weeds, on which only rats, roaches, pigeons, and humans thrive, is the next step towards a desert planet.

Who ever said that the earth should only grow food for humans? By what right do we exterminate what may be our only living companions in the universe? Humanists argue that man is the measure of all things, and that his reasoning abilities make him superior to all other life. Where is the proof of his alleged superiority? In the poisoned rivers? In the barren earth, baked by ultraviolet radiation no longer blocked by a damaged atmosphere? We reject the notion that humans are the purpose of life, and agree instead with author Frank Herbert, who wrote that the aim of life is simple:

"to maintain and produce coordinated patterns of greater and greater diversity. Life improves the closed system's capacity to sustain life. Life--all life--is in the service of life."

Modern humans are clearly not in service of life. It's not even clear that they are in service of themselves, from any point of view other than acquisition of material wealth.

Biotech firms are indeed following the same logic used in modern industrial agriculture, the logic of increasing short-term profit at the price of destroying the future. This logic has reversed millions of years of evolution, and caused nothing but damage to the biosphere. Outside the rich nations, human health has been damaged all along, and even among the elite of the US and Europe, health now begins to decline. The elite responds, typically, by creating new markets for less toxic water and food. How long will this last, while all around the exclusive organic farms and artisan wells, pesticides are being poured in every-increasing quantities onto crops specially engineered for this purpose, by Monsanto and its allies?

It can be argued that humans are replacing earth's natural diversity with an equal diversity of engineered products, but these products are at best only useful to humans, and what's more, unlike the earth's natural diversity, which stood the test of millions of years, the new products are hardly tested at all. Instead they are introduced one after another, as quickly as profit can be made, with no attempt to even calculate the side effects. As with the automobile industry, the real costs are hidden because they are too enormous to consider: topsoil loss, genetic pollution, weakened ecosystems, and acceleration of entropy.

"We must use technology to feed the starving millions," said the fertilizer and pesticide companies, as the small farmers were driven out of business by transnational agribusiness companies like ADM. Decades later, there are six billion of us, instead of two billion, and the starving millions are still starving, more than ever before. Now the genetic engineers want us to believe that if we extend the earth's carrying capacity even further, the starving millions will somehow magically be fed. Much more likely is that the earth's basic systems--climate, hydrological, atmosphere, topsoil--will continue to break down at an accelerating rate, while the poor nations fight the richer ones for their share of a dwindling pie.

And all for what? So that Americans and Europeans can have every convenience, and sit, immobilized, alone and isolated, in front of computers? So that cities can be connected by vast ribbons of asphalt, on which cars are frozen in bumper-to-bumper traffic? So that we can stuff our obese bodies with billions of contaminated animals, slaughtered in factory farms that look suspiciously like concentration camps? Industrial society has been a disaster for the human race too, not only for other species. Modern history is replete with monumental stupidity and shameful arrogance. The desire to turn ourselves and every other living thing into engineered products is only the latest example.

Any discussion of economics or biotechnology must be grounded in the understanding that we live in a depleted world. Modern industrial food production has greatly expanded earth's carrying capacity for one species--homo sapiens. In order to accomplish this, most of earth's biological diversity has been plowed under, and replaced with a small number of human food crops. These crops have been engineered into monocultures, in which a single strain of plant is spread over a huge area. The result has been extinction of species on an astonishing scale: some estimates place the loss as high as one-third of the species on earth. Species are disappearing at a much greater rate than previously thought, particularly in the tropical rainforests, where it's estimated that a species is lost to extinction every fifteen minutes. By comparison, the natural or "background" rate of extinction is a few species every million years. Many paleontologists believe we're headed into a mass extinction, equal in scope to the Cretaceous extinction that wiped out the dinosaurs. The difference is that this time, the cause is human activity, rather than an asteroid.

Depleting earth's diversity weakens the chances for the long-term survival of life. Each year, as the cities and suburbs expand, and the fields of monoculture expand with them, billions of tons of topsoil wash into the ocean, topsoil that took nature hundreds of years to make. It's not a coincidence that many of the birthplaces of civilization are now deserts. The illusion of modern prosperity is sustained by borrowing from the well-being of future generations, who will inherit a chaotic, parched world, with an atmosphere far less suitable for life. As wilderness becomes farmland, or wasteland, highly specialized species lose their ecological niches, and perish, to be replaced by weedy species that can adapt to hostile human environments. Like scar tissue, the weedy species are a warning that the earth is sick: the disordered ecosystems need time to heal, and may not recover from further assaults. A planet of weeds, on which only rats, roaches, pigeons, and humans thrive, is the next step towards a desert planet.

Who ever said that the earth should only grow food for humans? By what right do we exterminate what may be our only living companions in the universe? Humanists argue that man is the measure of all things, and that our reasoning abilities make us superior to all other life. Where is the proof of our alleged superiority? In the poisoned rivers? In the barren earth, baked by ultraviolet radiation that the damaged atmosphere no longer absorbs? We reject the notion that humans are the purpose of life, and agree instead with author Frank Herbert, who wrote that the aim of life is simple:

"to maintain and produce coordinated patterns of greater and greater diversity. Life improves the closed system's capacity to sustain life. Life--all life--is in the service of life."

Modern humans are clearly not in service of life. It's not even

clear that we're in service of ourselves, from any point of view other than acquisition of material wealth.

Biotech firms are following the same logic used in modern industrial agriculture, the logic of increasing short-term profit at the price of destroying the future. This logic has reversed millions of years of evolution, and caused nothing but damage to the biosphere. Outside of the rich nations, human health has suffered all along, and even among the elite of the US and Europe, health has begun to decline. The elite has responded, predictably, by creating new markets for less toxic water and food. How long will this last? All around the bottled water sources and exclusive organic farms, ever-increasing quantities of chemicals are being poured onto pesticide-resistant crops, engineered by Monsanto and its allies.

It could be argued that humans are replacing earth's natural diversity with an equal diversity of engineered products, but these products are at best only useful to humans, and what's more, unlike the earth's natural diversity, which passed the test of millions of years, the new products are hardly tested at all. Instead they are introduced one after another, as quickly as profits can be made, with no attempt to even calculate the side effects. Each new technological fix creates unforeseen problems, which require further fixes, in a never-ending spiral. The real costs are hidden, because they are too enormous to consider: topsoil loss, genetic pollution, weakened ecosystems, and acceleration of entropy.

During the "Green Revolution," transnational agribusiness companies drove small farmers out of business, and made fantastic profits, while promising to feed the starving millions. Decades later, there are six billion of us, instead of two billion, and the starving millions are still starving, more than ever before. Now the genetic engineers want us to believe that if we extend the earth's carrying capacity even further, the starving millions will somehow magically be fed. Much more likely is that the earth's basic systems of climate, hydrology, atmosphere, and topsoil, will continue to break down, while the poor nations fight the richer ones for their share of a dwindling pie.

And all for what? So that Americans and Europeans can have every convenience, and sit, immobilized, alone and isolated, in front of computers? So that cities can be connected by vast ribbons of asphalt, on which cars are frozen in bumper-to-bumper traffic? So that we can stuff our obese bodies with billions of contaminated animals, slaughtered in factory farms that look suspiciously like concentration camps? Industrial society has been a disaster for the human race too, not only for other species. Modern history is replete with monumental stupidity and shameful arrogance. The desire to turn ourselves and every other living thing into engineered products is only the latest example.

I was born in New York City, and I've lived in Boston, Massachusetts for over fifteen years. The details of my life are not relevant to the points that need to be made.

1. We are witnessing a massive extinction of species. At least one species dies off every hour. In the tropical rain forest we're probably losing a species every fifteen minutes. I say "probably" because we're cutting it down much too fast for anyone to figure out how many species it actually contains. Rainforest species are incredibly specialized, and may be confined to a very small area, as little as a square kilometer. A single rainforest tree can contain more species than an entire boreal forest. The rainforests are mostly being cut down to make packaging, cheap furniture, and marginal farmland which quickly turns to desert.

2. By comparison, the "background" or pre-human rate of extinction has been estimated as one species from any major group every million years. There have been five major extinctions in geological history, including one--the Permian--which wiped out 95 percent of all animal species. Previous extinctions were probably caused by astronomical events, such as a comet hitting the earth and filling the atmosphere with dust. Eventually the dust settled, the ice melted, and life restored itself. The current extinction is different: unlike a comet, the cause isn't going away, because the cause is us. Instead the cause is getting bigger, every day. The dust is not likely to settle for a very long time, and when it does, the earth will be a different place, because we are rapidly changing the chemical composition of the earth, its oceans, and its atmosphere.

3. Humans don't yet have the power to completely destroy life on earth in one stroke. Even if we set off all of our nuclear weapons at once, some percentage of bacteria and viruses would survive. However we do have the power to kill the earth slowly, by reducing its biological diversity. Life creates diversity because diversity is an excellent survival strategy. A diverse system can adapt to change. Imagine a forest that contains ten thousand species. Now let's say the temperature changes by a few degrees for some reason, and half the species in that forest become extinct overnight. That's bad news, but the forest still has five thousand species. Given enough time, it will adapt to the new climate and eventually evolve new species to replace the ones that died off. Now let's cut down this hypothetical forest, and replace it with a single species, something useful to us, corn for example. Once again the temperature changes by a few degrees. What are the odds that our single species of genetically engineered corn will survive the change? Not good. The corn dies, the topsoil turns to dust and blows away, and what was once a forest becomes a man-made desert, where nothing will grow, possibly for billions of years. Multiply this example times every ecosystem. Are humans reducing the probability that life will survive on earth? Yes.

4. The immediate consequence of reducing biological diversity is a

"planet of weeds." In biological terms, a weed is a generalized species that can easily adapt to a wide range of circumstances. When more specialized species are disrupted, the weeds move in, like scar tissue. Scar tissue is better than nothing, but it tends to be ugly. A planet of weeds will be unimaginably ugly. The main survivors will be humans--the ultimate weeds--along with the species that are useful to them, such as genetically modified cows, chickens, pigs, corn, etc. The remaining survivors will be rats, roaches, pigeons, and other species capable of adapting to the increasingly hostile man-made environment. Wilderness, in the sense of land not used by humans, will cease to exist.

5. It is pointless to argue that reducing biological diversity will make the earth an uglier place. For every person who thinks that wild nature is beautiful, there's another person who thinks it's boring and stupid. For every person who thinks modern society is hideous, there are many more who find it beautiful and exciting. Most people who live in "first world" countries enjoy driving cars, shopping, eating at restaurants, and dancing in discotheques. No one cares what people in poor countries think, so long as they don't try to stop the rich countries from doing whatever they want. In any case only the rich countries have the power to stop raping the earth, so it's Americans and Europeans and Japanese that have to be persuaded, not the starving masses in Africa. This means that the arguments against reducing biological diversity have to be logical, not aesthetic. Instead of arguing that destroying wilderness is ugly and wasteful, we have to argue that it directly reduces the odds that life--even human life--will survive on earth. Of course, most people are too self-centered to care whether humans survive, never mind animals and plants. Many people have been brainwashed by science-fiction and imagine that future generations of humans will turn themselves into robots, and escape into outer space. So there's really not much hope.

6. The essential function of all modern propaganda--including newspapers, magazines, books, television, movies, the internet, and any other medium you can imagine--is to convince us, during every waking moment, that there is only one right way for people to live. It takes considerable effort to sustain this illusion, which explains why the information or "content-creation" industry is now the largest and most profitable industry in the world. Escapist dramas like "Star Trek" try to convince us that thousands of years into the future, people will still live comfortable lives, with hot showers and slaves cooking their meals for them. Disney spends billions of dollars making "historical" movies in which our ancestors wear funny clothes but act like us, and even talk like us. In fact, there is little chance we could understand our ancestors and their tribal ways, any more than they could understand us. The American Indian tribes were tragically unable to understand the European invaders, as Kurt Vonnegut describes acidly in his classic "Breakfast of Champions":

"The chief weapon of the sea pirates was their capacity to astonish. No one could believe, until it was much too late, just

how heartless and greedy they were."

When asked to sell his land, the great Shawnee chief Tecumseh said, "Sell a country? Why not sell the air, the clouds, and the great sea, as well as the earth?" How could he imagine that future generations would sell not only the land, the water, the air, and the electromagnetic spectrum, but even the genetic structure of life itself?

7. The history of industrial society is the history of diversity--both biological and social--yielding to monoculture. The Church of Euthanasia is fighting for diversity, and is therefore opposing all forms of human growth, including economic growth, technological growth, and especially population growth. We want to see less people, using less stuff and making less garbage. The average person considers these goals deeply offensive and anti-social. They can't help being offended, because their values are steeped in humanism. Humanism is the belief that man is the measure of all things, and that without him the world would have no meaning or value. This arrogant notion leads directly to a hierarchical order of being, with man at the top. As God informs us in the book of Genesis, we're supposed to "be fruitful and become many and fill the earth and subdue it, and have in subjection... every living creature." We've done just that, with catastrophic results. Humanism is the greatest heresy in the Church of Euthanasia, which may be the world's first anti-human religion.

8. Humanism has been exported to every corner of the globe, and with it the mechanical world-view. Kings kept tax records, built roads, sent mail, established uniform codes of justice, turned forests into ships, and sent armies to loot and pillage distant lands. Thanks to their efforts we have Nike and Pizza Hut. The mechanical world-view has brought us objectivity, standardization, predictability, division of labor, and efficiency. Since there's no hope whatsoever of reversing these trends, the Church of Euthanasia's position is purely symbolic. We can't stop humans from killing the earth, but we can make them feel guilty about it. And we can refuse to participate, by not having children, by consuming as little as possible, and finally, by killing ourselves.

What has and does interest you in electronic music, either as a consumer or producer?

I started playing piano and guitar in 1977, first studying rock, and later jazz. I studied music theory for many years, with several excellent teachers including the tenor player Jerry Bergonzi. In the late eighties I played in a swing band, a fusion band, a psychedelic rock band, performed solo guitar in restaurants and on the street, and taught at a small music school. My greatest musical inspirations were--and still are--John Abercrombie (particularly his collaborations with Jan Hammer) and Ralph Towner, as well as Art-Rock bands such as Pink Floyd and Yes. My first exposure to electronic music was the work of Vangelis and other early synthesizer composers. In 1991, I began crossdressing, and moved to Provincetown to pursue a career as a "Paris is Burning"-style female impersonator, but I couldn't compete with the bitchy street divas who had nothing to fall back on but hooking or drug-dealing. I was exposed to house and deep-house, and was especially moved by the soulful quality of Black Box's "Dreamland". Later, Robin S. and Orb also made an big impression on me. I acquired a drum machine, and started making electronic music in 1993: "I Just Can't Let Go" is one of my earliest tracks and clearly shows the influence of house music. At this time I also released my first CD, a frightening and starkly beautiful ambient sound collage called "Demons In My Head".

You use techno as a medium to convey a message or content - is this strategically valid bearing in mind the apolitical atmosphere that can be cultivated in the scene?

I am against politics, so for me, the apolitical nature of the techno scene is an asset, not a weakness. Voting in elections only legitimates the political process, which can't be separated from industrialism. To destroy industrial society, we need to lose all political illusions, build small autonomous local structures, and transform ourselves on an individual basis. Mass-produced music is a widely accepted form of propaganda, and therefore conveys content easily, providing the music is skillfully created.

How are you perceived by other techno-producers... are you considered as posing a threat to the 'purity' of techno's quest, do you care!?

I am against purity also. I'm often criticized for using technology to convey an anti-technological message. Only barefoot Indians in the woods have the right to denounce the ugliness of industrial society. Those of us who have access to mass media are tainted by it, and should therefore keep our mouths shut. Nonsense! The tools that were used to make something are also the best tools for dismantling it. Our global, industrial prison-state has six billion inmates, consumes unimaginable quantities of minerals, plants, and animals, and vomits a toxic soup of death

into every remote cavity of this once-flourishing planet. The beast is howling and growing larger by the second. To think that such a monstrous reality can be affected by hiding in the wilderness--or what's left of it--is simply naive.

You launched a directive against Berlin's Love Parade, what was the reasoning behind this and how did the situation play out?

The Love Parade is clear example of globalism. Its totalitarian slogan--"One World, One Future"--could easily have been lifted from Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World." A million standardized humans gathered around a phallic DJ tower, worshipping at the altar of homogenized techno-rave culture, resembles nothing so much as a scene from "Triumph of the Will," and I said so, on the German equivalent of MTV.

Any other techno-consumerist institutions fall into your rifle sights?

The central conflict of modern society is between diversity and monoculture. Biological diversity--what Indians called "The Great Mystery"--is the fundamental process of life, and the greatest absolute good in any sustainable ethical system. It is biological diversity that turned the Earth from a ball of molten rock into a rich, interdependent web of life. In the words of Frank Herbert, "[the aim of life] is simple: to maintain and produce coordinated patterns of greater and greater diversity. Life improves the closed system's capacity to sustain life. Life--all life--is in the service of life." By contrast, modern humans are clearly not in the service of life: the birthplaces of civilization are mostly deserts now.

The plants and animals that are useful to us become monocultures, identical at the genetic level. This process of impoverishment is the opposite of evolution, and is correctly termed "devolution." Species are selected not because they stand the test of time, but for immediate economic gain. The average person takes a drive in the countryside, sees mile after mile of corn fields, and thinks "how pleasant to be away from the city." In fact he is witnessing a holocaust, in which countless species have been exterminated to make room for one genetic organism.

The assault on biological diversity has been paralleled by an equal assault on social diversity. Where there were once thousands of tribal nations in America, each with their own way of living uniquely adapted to their circumstances, now there is only one nation, and only one way to live. Like the dozens of species that become extinct every day as the tropical rainforest disappears, the diversity of culture also disappears, to be replaced by standardized humans, who only know shopping malls and discotheques.

Having evolved on the Earth, but no longer *of* the Earth, drawing a distinction between themselves and every other form of life,

domesticated humans emerge as the super-weed, capable of adapting rapidly to the hostile urban environments that their technologies create. The next step towards a desert planet is a planet of weeds, on which only rats, roaches, pigeons, and humans survive, slurping the thin gruel of civilization.

A fair proportion of your album is taken up with criticising consumerism, even though a socio-cultural scene like techno is sedated by concepts such as lifestyleism and hedonism.....

Throughout modern history, hedonism has been the preoccupation of that tiny elite that benefits from a society based on accumulation of wealth, division of labor, and domestication of wilderness. Hedonism is the ultimate form of consumption, and only has meaning in the work-camp, where it can be contrasted with its opposite extreme, slavery. My challenge is to make propaganda entertaining enough to be easily digested by the consumer elite, without losing its subversive quality.

The Church Of Euthanasia is based on a diverse set of principals, do you want to expand and explain for those unfamiliar with this organisation....

The Church of Euthanasia (CoE) is a nonprofit religious order dedicated to restoring balance between humans and the remaining species on Earth through voluntary population reduction. The CoE is recognized by the US government as a tax-exempt educational foundation; contributions are tax-deductible. The Church has only one commandment, and it is "Thou Shalt Not Procreate." Membership implies a lifetime vow to never have children. The vow is irrevocable: a member who becomes pregnant or causes a pregnancy must obtain an abortion or be excommunicated. There are currently over 250 official members, mostly in the US, though there are many more members who choose not to register themselves for personal reasons.

You talk about the US media, and your appearance on Jerry Springer. Also you (jokingly?) refer to abduction theories in your founding statements - a subject that the media has turned into 'panic status'. Do you have particular critiques or strategies for dealing with mass media phenomenom?

The CoE's activities often appear nonsensical or provocative. This results from a deliberate strategy, rooted in Dadaism and other anti-art movements, and based on the historical observation that paradox is the best antidote to totalitarianism. When everything is clearly defined, assimilated, and organized into dualisms (right, wrong, good, evil) or neat categories (work, progress, art, etc.) there is no possibility for original thought or meaningful communication. This is why successful totalitarian movements seek to control the appearance of reality through propaganda. The collapse of the Soviet regime can be seen from this point of view as a propaganda failure: physical coercion is simply not cost-effective.

The more sophisticated methods of advertising, education, and voluntary self-censorship have proved their effectiveness in the US and Europe. These techniques require a highly competitive society in which literally everything is reduced to commodity, including not only the physical (land, water, air, the electromagnetic spectrum) and the biological (plants, animals, genetic material, sexual pleasure) but also more abstract entities such as entertainment, information, and ideas in general. Because a commodity-based society is so highly interdependent, even small disruptions are intolerable; its members must be specialized, and adapted to constant technological change. Conformity is achieved with deep, life-long conditioning, but this tends to make psychological conflict unbearable. Ambiguity and confusion are therefore the CoE's most powerful weapons: confronted with insoluble conflicts which shatter their convenient fictions, people are forced to think for themselves.

Being a marxist I find it hard to swallow a remedy for peace/stability that doesn't address concepts like class struggle, abolition of money, economic analysis, etc. You also describe yourself as extremely political, do you see concepts like marxism as valid, or has politics (for you) moved beyond this?

I don't necessarily equate peace and stability. Tribal societies were generally quite stable, but rarely peaceful in the modern sense of non-violence. In any case I'm only tangentially interested in social justice. Socialists argued against private ownership, while racing to out-produce the West, and leaving a trail of destroyed wilderness behind them. Marx didn't question industrial progress and his critique is therefore useless to me. He took the superiority of man as a given and focused on the relationships between classes: I'm concerned with the relationships between *species*. If humanism is the belief that man is the measure of all things, then Marxism is merely a subset of humanism.

At the fringe of the technological elite we find trans-humanism, the belief that only man's mind is important. Smart drugs, genetic techniques, cryonics, bionics, and cybernetics all take the inferiority of human flesh as their starting point. The fusion of man with machine is glorified in popular culture (e.g. Star Trek), and particularly in techno-rave culture. Catholicism and technological utopianism are both forms of escapism, rejections of the terms of life and death on Earth. The CoE is anti-human, embraces the biological, and defines evolution towards diversity as the ultimate ethical good. Thus the CoE seizes the term "pro-life", and defines itself as a truly pro-life religion.

The Boston Phoenix - Section One - March 15, 1996

FREAK SHOW

At the BPL, activists enliven a moribund political campaign

by Al Giordana

The 1996 presidential campaign, like most political contests in this era, has become so ritualized that it's hard to find meaning in any of it. The candidates and the press follow a rigid set of scripts that keeps the debate narrow and lifeless. That's why a candidate like Pat Buchanan, with his authoritarian pizzazz, was able to dominate the news coverage in the campaign's opening weeks.

But Buchanan has no monopoly on stirring up the status quo. This was proved by some local activists who stepped into that void last Tuesday--election day--outside the Boston Public Library.

At 7:30 that morning, a group of five volunteers unfurled a 25-by-10-foot banner outside the library--one of Boston's largest polling places and a favorite site for live media reports on the election. The banner, red on black, featured three enormous letters-- GOP--with a huge swastika inside the "O."

Meanwhile, another half-dozen activists, who said they were from a different group, held signs for the Unabomber '96 write-in campaign, greeting voters as they went to the polls: "If elected," pledged the signs, "he will not serve...All you have to lose is the political illusion. ARE YOU READY FOR THE RUPTURE?"

A videotape of this drama reviewed by the Phoenix shows the public spectacle that ensued--and the media's own schizophrenic response when the out-of-the-ordinary crosses their path.

As soon as the GOP-swastika banner was unveiled, a New England Cable News reporter and crew descended upon its creator, Chris Korda of Somerville.

"We're here to support Pat Buchanan," announced Korda, repeating her soundbites with the skill and frequency of a modern political candidate.

"Are you really a Republican?" asked the reporter.

"Absolutely," answered Korda. "The GOP is the face of fascism in the United States. I support them. I support Pat Buchanan 100 percent."

As Korda sparred with the NECN reporter, the WRKO talk-radio van pulled up to the curb on Boylston Street. Pat Whitley and Margie Clapprood were inside, broadcasting their daily call-in show live.

Whitley emerged from the van and approached Korda and her banner. When Whitley realized he was on camera, he gave videographer Lydia Eccles (also campaign manager for the Unabomber) a playful smile. But as soon as WRKO went back on the air, live, Whitley feigned outrage over the GOP-swastika banner. He slipped the headphones to Korda while state GOP chairman Jim Rappaport--speaking from WRKO's studios--demanded that Korda and her group apologize for maligning his party.

"We have no intention of apologizing whatsoever," replied Korda.

"Are you Larouche people?" asked Whitley.

"No, we have no affiliation with Lyndon Larouche," said Korda. "Am I going to be allowed to speak?"

"Wait a minute," Whitley said, both to radio listeners and to his on-air guests. "She wants to say something. It'll be interesting to hear."

As Korda stuck to theme and message ("We support Pat Buchanan, the face of the fascist party in this country"), Whitley soured.

"Are you, in essence, a member of the Nazi Party?" he asked.

"I'm a loyal supporter of Pat Buchanan," answered Korda.

Meanwhile, a silver-haired man who identified himself as a library official was demanding that the group remove the banner.

Whitley headed back to the radio van and Clapprood--the 1990 Democratic nominee for lieutenant governor--came out. As she realized she was being filmed by Eccles, Clapprood adjusted her headset and said, "My hair looks best in the snow." Then she hammed it up singing, "Let it snow, let it snow, let it snow."

"There are more Unabomber signs than there are for Clinton, Gore, or all the Republicans combined," Clapprood reported, on the air. "So it looks like the Unabomber is leading."

A tall young man began shouting at the demonstrators. "Fuck you, you Nazi fascist pigs!" He turned to Eccles's video camera, hitting it five times. "Get your fucking camera out of my face!"

He then faced a photographer who was taking still shots, splashed coffee in his face, and punched him, knocking off the

photographer's glasses.

That this bystander's hostility was directed at the cameras around him, rather than at the people holding the swastika sign, suggests that the public intuitively understands the media's role in its frustration.

"What's going on here?" Clapprood jumped in, as the violent man ran into the library. She asked the still photographer, "Who are you with?"

"No one," he said. "I'm a photographer taking pictures. That guy works for the library."

"So you're just an independent photographer, and you just got attacked," said Clapprood, speaking into her microphone to the wider radio audience. "We've got some tough times out here."

"It's very offensive," Whitley commented, on air, from the van, "to see a bunch of kids out here."

"It's in tremendously poor taste," echoed another observer who was being interviewed by Clapprood. "It fills me with tremendous disgust."

Clapprood labeled the banner holders "a splinter group" and spoke of the violence she just witnessed. She warned listeners, "It may go on." (In other words: stay tuned!)

"What's your point in being here?" Clapprood, acting outraged herself, asked Korda. "Out of respect for what's happened in Israel, why don't you just take your sign and go home?"

"Oh, absolutely not," responded Korda. "We're here to support Pat Buchanan. There are people in this country who are ready to bring fascism here."

"Have you been politically active in some Nazi party?" Clapprood asked her.

"No."

"Well," she said, "there you go," then walked back to her van.

Yet another witness to the drama approached Korda, laughing, "They don't get it. I think you're doing a service."

Whitley and the other journalists might have been able to make more sense of the situation had they paid closer attention. When Whitley and the NECN reporter each asked Korda what group she represented, Korda replied, "Institute for Global Dada"--a reference to the 1016 phenomenon in Zurich that turned art history on its head.

Dada, as critic Greil Marcus noted in his "Lipstick Traces: A

Secret History of the Twentieth Century (Harvard University Press, 1989), was, simply put, the act of being in the right place at the right time--and the knowledge that both could be invented.

In this sense, the GOP banner and the Unabomber '96 campaign resurrected the Situationist movement of Paris in the '50s and '60s, which refined Dada for the media age by baiting the press with pranks that revealed serious ideas.

As long as the daily media continue to present campaign coverage in a ritualized format, allowing candidates and consultants to conspire with journalists (and even their rivals) in order to determine the public face of the contest, the door is open for more actions like this.

Or, as Clapprood told her listeners, this may go on. Let's hope so.

New York Post, Friday, March 29, 1996

Page Six

by Richard Johnson

LOST CAUSE

Simon and Schuster editor-in-chief Michael Korda's bizarre daughter Chris is an avid politician. The self-professed reverend of the Church of Euthanasia--which advocates cannibalism, abortion, sodomy and euthanasia to stem the population explosion--was photographed by Freedom Writer magazine lensman Barry Morgan Thomas campaigning at a Bob Dole rally the night before the New Hampshire primary. The sign Chris carried was emblazoned with the predictably strange plea, "Write in for president--Unabomber."

YET ANOTHER INTERVIEW WITH REV. KORDA

by Jonathan Konrath of *Rock Out Censorship*

January 1996

What is the Church of Euthanasia? What are your views?

The Church of Euthanasia is a non-profit educational foundation devoted to restoring balance between Humans and the remaining species on Earth. We believe this can only be accomplished by a massive *voluntary* population reduction, which will require a leap in Human consciousness to a new *species awareness*.

Every aspect of the deepening global environmental crisis, including climate change, reduction of biodiversity, poisoning of the water and atmosphere, and topsoil erosion, directly results from the over-abundance of a single species: homo sapiens. The Human population is increasing by one million every four days, according to the Washington-based Population Reference Bureau. This is a net increase of 95 million per year, the current population of Mexico.

Even a major war or epidemic hardly dents the rate of growth, and modern wars have tremendous environmental consequences. It is for these practical reasons, as well as moral ones, that Euthanasists support only *voluntary* forms of population reduction, including suicide, abortion, and sodomy, which we define as any sexual act not intended for procreation. We are also fiercely vegetarian, and support cannibalism for those who insist on eating flesh.

How, when and why did you start the CoE? How big is it now?

The CoE was inspired by a dream, in which I confronted an alien intelligence known as "the Being" who speaks for the inhabitants of Earth in other dimensions. The Being warned that our planet's ecosystem is failing, and that our leaders deny this. The Being asked why our leaders lie to us, and why so many of us believe these lies. I awoke from the dream moaning the church's infamous slogan, "Save the Planet - Kill Yourself."

The CoE was incorporated on March 25, 1994, and the IRS granted us tax-exempt status in July 1995. We now have around a hundred "card-carrying" members who have sworn to uphold the One Commandment ("Thou Shalt Not Procreate"), and well over a thousand "virtual" members on the Internet, plus clergy and directors.

Is the CoE really a church?

The CoE was founded as a church, because the world-view that inspires it is fundamentally *spiritual*, not political. According to the IRS, our *primary* activity is the dissemination of information, and we are therefore tax-exempt as an educational foundation, but this is purely a legal distinction. We continue to call ourselves a church, act like a church, and *be* a church. We have issued many sermons on the internet, and held several public services here in Boston. Construction of the CoE chapel was

completed in 1995, and our first official members-only service was held there in October.

How have you been involved with the internet?

The CoE's presence on the internet started in August of 1994. The original goal was simply to disseminate the electronic version of our journal ("Snuff It"). We started out by setting up a moderated mailing list (SNUFFIT-L), and then arranged for it to be fully archived at U. Michigan's ETEXT archives. This was followed by a massive e-mail spam (27,000 Save the Planet Kill Yourself "greeting cards" sent to folks who posted to certain Usenet groups). It took a long while for the flames to die down, but the end result was a very successful mailing list with over a thousand members. The list has also been used to disseminate "e-sermons" and church news, as well as other texts, including the Unabomber's manifesto, ibu's anarchist classic "Bolo'bolo," and Bob Arson's controversial "Butchering the Human Carcass for Consumption."

In January 1995, with the invaluable assistance of Father R. Scott LaMorte, the CoE launched its official WWW site. The site contains all of our material, including past and present issues of Snuff It, complete with graphics and color photographs. Some of the material is linked to a hypertextual history of the CoE which is accessible from the home page; this helps new visitors by giving them a place to start. Perhaps the most important feature of the web site is the "on-line resources" page, which consists of pointers to various "church approved" sites (Princeton's National Directory of "morning after" pill providers, for example) and information on our sister organizations: the Voluntary Human Extinction Movement (VHEMT), the Gaia Liberation Front (GLF), the Freedom Club, and the First Church of Christ, Abortionist. The site also includes an elaborate on-line catalog and order form.

At some point someone asked whether the CoE had a Usenet group. We soon discovered that the word "euthanasia" did not appear anywhere in the Usenet hierarchy; obviously a new group was called for. The original proposals called for some type of "alt" group, but response was so positive that we decided to aim for the "big seven": talk.euthanasia passed by 211 to 57 in May 1995.

What other activities is the church involved with? (rallies, marches)

We cause trouble fairly regularly. Our last big show was the 1995 Boston First Night parade. I won't tell you about it here though, because I couldn't do it justice; it's thoroughly covered in issue #3 of Snuff It. Visit our web site, or pick up a copy at Tower Records. The pictures say it all...

How does the CoE differ from pro-choice groups, such as the Feminist Majority?

We're not pro-choice. We're pro-abortion. There's a big difference. Abortion usually involves destroying a small Human

fetus by sucking it out of the womb with a vacuum. "Pro-choice" is a euphemism created by people who want to keep abortion legal but don't have the guts to face this reality. The strategy of conceding that abortion is morally indefensible in order to build a wider coalition has led directly to a dwindling *Roe vs. Wade* instead of abortion on demand throughout pregnancy. Abortion should be safe, legal, and free, everywhere.

Many of the folks who get worked up over abortion show little or no remorse when it comes to slaughtering their fellow creatures and eating their flesh. In addition, these same people tend to be supporters of capital punishment, and enemies of sexual freedom. These observations suggest that the underlying issue is not compassion for living beings at all, but fear of sexuality. The connections between fascism and repression of orgasmic libido described by Dr. Wilhelm Reich in his study of "emotional plague" seem especially relevant. In short, the pope should be dining on Human fetuses.

Have you had opposition from the religious right/moral majority? Do you feel they have unjust ties with the US government?

Actually we get most of our opposition from "liberals," the type of super politically-correct folks that the Unabomber directed so much rage at in his manifesto. We've been very disappointed in the Christian right; we've baited them repeatedly and the bastards keep turning the other cheek. It goes without saying that the Christian right is tied to the U.S. government; they elected Reagan and Bush, after all. The interesting question is what their real agenda is, behind all the pious fundamentalist posturing, and the answer depends on which conspiracy theories you subscribe to, if any. The popular "Illuminati" theory pits the Vatican empire against the Freemason/Jewish/Protestant empire that began in England and is now centered in the U.S., with the two giants battling for control of the Earth's resources.

This idea also comes up in the ultra-libertarian "patriot" or "freedom fighter" type of rhetoric that the militias have been using their new-found media attention to circulate. These people see the so-called "one-world" government (i.e. the United Nations and/or the Federal Reserve Bank) as a sign of the Apocalypse, and rail against the replacement of cash with electronic money. In their worst nightmares, religion is forbidden, abortion is mandatory, and everyone speaks the same language and has a microchip implanted in them (the "mark of the beast"). They're stockpiling automatic weapons for just such an occasion; Dr. Hunter S. Thompson refers to them as "the guns and Jesus crowd," appropriately enough.

I tend to view this type of thinking as a dangerous distraction from the real issue. Yes, there have undoubtedly been, and continue to be warring factions among the dominant Humans, but what all factions have in common is the idea that the Earth is giant cigar, and should be smoked, as soon as possible. People have asked me whether the CoE supports a "one-world" government, and my answer is always that it depends on what type of government. If it's a government based on

commodification, and if it inspires vast structures of domination and control, then obviously we're against it. If it's a government based on compassion for all beings, and if it inspires the idea that Humans are one species housed among the many other species of plants and animals that comprise the living being we call Earth, then we're all for it.

I'd also have to say that while the Freemasons are a creepy bunch, the Catholics are absolutely terrifying, and much more public. Remember, we're talking about the institution that launched the Crusades: state-of-the-art repression, torture and genocide, for their time. Lately the Vatican has been teaming up with the Islamic countries to make sure nothing useful is accomplished at various global population conferences. To think that an institution as morally bankrupt as the Catholic Church can still wield so much power...it's outrageous. I can't support violence, it being against my religion and all, but sometimes it's tempting...if I ever make an exception, it'll be for the Pope.

Why the four pillars? Why don't we just nuke France, drive-by a bunch of politicians, or add cyanide to the drinking water to lower the population?

Remember, we only support *voluntary* methods. In our view, any other methods will only perpetuate the cycle of karma, and are therefore doomed to fail. There are plenty of folks (too many to list) that support mass murder, especially of the poor and black (by the rich and white): it's hardly a new idea. Relatively few people are willing to support the more egalitarian notion of complete Human extinction. The only two groups I know of are our sister organizations, VHEMT (the Voluntary Human Extinction Movement), and the GLF (Gaia Liberation Front).

VHEMT's motto is "live long and die out": they advocate no more births, ever, until the Human population dwindles to nothing. The GLF, on the other hand, views Humans as a "hostile alien species," and advocates worldwide distribution of genetically engineered airborne viruses that attack only Humans (with provisions for a second round after the generals and politicians come out of their shelters). Like VHEMT, we're opposed to further birthing, but we're not (yet) convinced that complete extinction is warranted; we're hoping to restore *balance* between Humans and the other species. We agree with the GLF's observation that "while Humans may have evolved *on* the Earth, they are no longer *of* the Earth"; we just can't support their methods.

Has the CoE had problems with censorship or other opposition?

Not so far, surprisingly enough. It's interesting to consider which side of the population issue our Federal government is really on, particularly when viewed as part of the increasingly powerful defacto "world government" of trans-national corporations. Do the corporations assume that more people = more customers, and therefore support limitless population growth? I think not. In fact, as Jeremy Rifkin and many others have pointed out, the new global economy is all about creating greater wealth for

fewer people, by replacing people with *cybernetic systems* (robots). This explains the mysterious economic recovery in which "productivity" rises even though unemployment rises.

Marx and his followers always maintained that capitalism contains the seeds of its own destruction: if you keep replacing labor with automated machinery, eventually no one has money to buy consumer goods and the corporations collapse from lack of income. Unfortunately, what Marx could not foresee is that to an ever-greater extent, corporations are becoming their own customers, by producing and marketing goods for, and to, each other. In the not-too-distant future, the vast majority of the population may find themselves excluded from the economic system entirely. Hakim Bey and others have written about this possibility extensively, and I believe it was Bey who coined the term "temporary autonomous zone" to describe the areas of anarchy that would flourish outside the fortresses of "Babylon."

All of this supports the argument that government, in its various forms, has everything to gain from population reduction, particularly reduction of the "have-nots." Those fortunate enough to possess skills useful to the new "information society," the "symbolic analysts" (e.g. computer programmers) and other "knowledge workers," will be in demand, for the moment, but the masses of regular folks are expendable, and are in fact disrupting progress towards the goal. Judging by the writings of Newt Gingrich's "extropian" friends, the goal appears to be the "downloading" of genetically altered Human consciousness into machines, to facilitate the creation of super-robots for the conquest of outer space. Sounds like Dr. Who, right? Read their magazine ("Extropy") or visit their web site at <http://www.c2.org/~arkuat/extr/> if you don't believe me.

Our leaders may not be censoring us (yet), but they obviously aren't interested in compassion towards other species either; they're converting wilderness into wasteland as fast as they can get their hands on it. If the government actually supports our population-reduction efforts, they probably do so for all the wrong reasons. This would be unfortunate, but would explain the lack of opposition.

What's an extropian?

An extropian is a libertarian trans-Humanist. Humanism can be defined as the belief that "man is the measure of all things"; trans-Humanists believe that man's alleged "intelligence" is the measure of all things, as distinct from his presumably grotty biological "limitations." By comparison, Euthanasists are neither Humanist or trans-Humanist, but *anti-Humanist*: we are firmly opposed to the arrogant notion that Humans are superior beings. The trans-Humanists (particularly the extropians) are about as close as anyone gets to being our mortal enemies. Very few people seem to realize that Newt and his pals the Tofflers (authors of "Futureshock," "Third Wave," etc.) are extropians, or what the implications of this fact might be.

The trans-Humanists would gladly sacrifice every non-Human living being (and many of the Human beings) on Earth for their

dream of transforming the entire universe into a cyberspace ruled by intelligent machines. Their fantasies of immortality (rooted in fear of both life *and* death) oppose them to the biological; thus they actively seek to "defetishize" food and sex, among other things. The idea is that a Human, through proper conditioning, will (and in many cases, already does) find a tasty meal or a good orgasm less satisfying than, say, writing a really clever software program (e.g. see Nick Szabo's "Uploading, Self-transformation and Sexual Engineering," at <http://www.digicash.com/~nick/uploadsex.html>).

Such conditioning, combined with genetic engineering and so-called "smart drugs," will produce a Human suitably adapted to life underground or better still, life in outer space. This is convenient, since the trans-Human program will increase short-term order (extropy) at the price of unimaginable global entropy, and quickly render the surface of the planet uninhabitable even for Humans. Trans-Humanists also propose to remove all forms of the verb "to be" from the English language (the resulting language is known as "E-prime"), in order to facilitate its assimilation by machines, which apparently have a hard time interpreting qualitative associations (or anything else that really matters if you ask me).

What has been some of the more amusing opposition the church has received?

As I said, our worst enemies are usually "liberals," and the best example I can think of took place at Boston's Population Awareness Day rally back in 1994. The local chapter of ZPG (Zero Population Growth) invited us initially, and then reneged when they found out who we were. Of course, we showed up anyway, in full regalia, with signs saying "Save the Planet, Kill Yourself," a giant RU-486 pill, and a ten-foot tall effigy of the Being. Meanwhile the other groups (ZPG, Carrying Capacity Network, Sierra Club, etc.) were sitting behind their tables, thunderstruck, while a hired band played jazz standards. It was absolutely pathetic. We were ranting, chanting, screaming environmental facts, reading Allen Ginsberg's "Howl," so of course we drew a crowd. There were confrontations and arguments; people were hating it, or loving it, and asking questions. So what did ZPG do? Call the cops, of course. The next thing we knew, ranger Doherty was politely explaining that we had to move because ZPG had a permit and we were "disrupting their rally." What rally? This type of thing has happened to us repeatedly, and in every case, the police were our friends, relatively speaking.

What do you think of the Exon bill? Would such actions hinder the church?

It sucks, and yes, they definitely would.

How has the CoE been involved in the net anti-censorship movement?

Every anti-censorship petition we receive (and there have been many) is distributed to SNUFFIT-L and linked to the web site.

Our IRS tax status forbids us from lobbying, so we can't get involved beyond this.

How do you encourage people to help stop net censorship?

Personally (in a non-CoE capacity), I have written many letters, and repeatedly criticized my provider (Netcom) for not making its position on net censorship publicly known. Netcom replied several times that they had no position, but I noticed that the last time the House debated the CDA, Netcom finally mentioned the VTW alert in their message of the day; it's a step in the right direction.

What are future plans for the church?

More of the same, really. We're interested in long-term sustainable effort, rather than a burst of rapid growth followed by disintegration. We're in this for the long haul, so we try to move slowly and decisively. Every day we reach a few more people: they tell their friends, and our world-view grows. Not that there won't be surprises; of course there will, but the emphasis will continue to be on persuading more and more people to not procreate and not eat flesh. This is the path we're on right now, the path of compassion for *all* beings.

Personally, my New Year's resolution is to build an orgone accumulator. I've been reading Reich lately, and I resonate very strongly with a lot of what he says. He argues convincingly that "civilization" is an ongoing attempt to repress natural sexual energy into vast neurotic structures of domination and control, and that the primary agents of repression are parents, closely followed by schools. Most of the damage is done before a child begins to talk. The child builds walls of "character armor" (emotional scar tissue) to keep out the poisonous emotions of pain and rage and fear, but unfortunately the suit of armor blocks pleasure and love and compassion just as easily. By the time the child is a teenager, the "pain is so big you feel nothing at all," as John Lennon said in "Working Class Hero." The teenager becomes sexually active, but since the natural libido is unable to flow through the armor, it gets deflected into "secondary" neurotic drives such as narcissism, sadism, and masochism. Our sex-negative society considers these behaviors "normal" and reinforces them; thus the resulting adult is empowered to inflict similar damage on his or her children (or students), and the vicious cycle is completed.

The CoE's efforts help to break this cycle. Obviously if people don't have children then they can't inflict any damage on them. The CoE also helps by being sex-positive: "all acts of love and pleasure are our rituals," as the Wiccans are fond of saying. This is very important, because pleasure eventually leads to awareness of suffering, which is something we desperately need more of right now. People aren't callous and insensitive to the suffering of their fellow beings by choice: they're just trapped inside their armor, unable to *feel* much of anything. Through pleasure, they become more able to feel pain, and as they feel pain, they begin to feel *compassion*, first for themselves, and then, gradually, for all beings.

How can people get more information about the church? How can they help or get involved?

If you're on the Internet, we're everywhere. If you have access to the web, <http://www.paranoia.com/coe/> is the URL, or just do a Lycos or Yahoo search on the word "euthanasia" and we're bound to turn up. If you're e-mail only, just send an e-mail to listserv@netcom.com containing **ONLY** the line:

subscribe snuffit-l

If all else fails, you can e-mail me at coe@netcom.

For folks who aren't on the Internet, our postal address is The Church of Euthanasia, P.O.Box 261, Somerville, MA 02143. If you send us a SASE we'll send you a catalog and some information, but honestly your best bet is to go for broke and send us \$2 (cash is fine) for issue #3 of Snuff It. It's a really good one: 32 pages, packed with photos and graphics, and it includes the catalog. Trust me, you won't be sorry.

One way to participate would be to join the CoE. If you choose to not procreate, you're a member already, but why not make it official? Membership includes a life-time subscription to the printed version of Snuff It, a 28-page E-sermon booklet, and a lovely embossed certificate suitable for framing, all for only \$10.

If you like to write or speak and have some "fire in the belly," we could also use guest sermons. Other than that, the best thing you can do is help spread the word. Talk to people. Proselytize shamelessly. Ask us for flyers and catalogs, or better still, make your own: everything we have on the net is yours to copy and distribute. Get on the radio or television. Be a nuisance. Cause trouble. piss people off, especially your breeding friends. Do it now!